DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 130	EA 013 582

AUTHOR	Davis, John E.; Ryan, Doris W.
TITLE	Constraints on Secondary School Programs. The Impact of Declining Enrolments, Collective Agreements, and Regulations.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Dept. of Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	283p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M7A 1N8 ($6.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Board of Education Role; Class Size; *Collective Bargaining; Contracts; Curriculum Problems; *Declining Enrollment; Difficulty Level; Educational Attitudes; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Graduation Requirements; Principals; *Program Development; *Retrenchment; School Closing; School Districts; School Size; Secondary Education; State Government; State Legislation; Student Teacher Ratio; Teaching Load
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario; Ontario Department of Education (Canada); Ontario Ministry of Ed H S 1 Circulars; Rules and Regulations

ABSTRACT

Declining enrollment, collective bargaining agreements, and government requirements will reduce educational opportunities in Ontario's secondary schools unless new educational policies and technologies and increased interinstitutional cooperation are used to create alternative programs. This study analyzed questionnaire data on school size, enrollment decline, program changes, effects of government and collective bargaining, and school-community cooperation from a survey of 312 Ontario secondary school principals and from interviews with 30 of these same principals. It also examined Ontario government documents from 1972-80 covering credit, course, curriculum, and textbook requirements and class scheduling; 35 teacher-school board collective bargaining agreements governing pupil-teacher ratios, instructional load, class size, and "redundancy" (layoff) provisions; solutions to secondary school program problems in eight other Canadian provinces; and a case study of one small northern Ontario school district. Data analysis showed that enrollment decline, bargaining agreements, and societal priorities (as expressed through government requirements) would reduce students' options and the number of teachers and courses and would narrow the range of difficulty levels in schools. Such program constraints may be avoided through new educational technologies; increased cooperation among school boards, municipalities, and provincial officials; and more flexible educational policies. (RW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONSTRAINTS ON SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The Impact of Ministry Documents, Collective Agreements, and Budgets

JOHN E. DAVIS, Principal Investigator
DORIS W. RYAN, Principal Investigator

This research report was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

Ministry
of
Education

Ministry of
Colleges and
Universities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. M. Hildebrand
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CONSTRAINTS ON SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The Impact of Declining Enrolments, Collective Agreements, and Regulations

---

JOHN E. DAVIS, Principal Investigator
DORIS W. RYAN, Principal Investigator

This research report was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

Hon. Bette Stephenson, M.D., Minister
Dr. H. K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

© Minister of Education, Ontario 1980
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION

Davis, John E.
Constraints on secondary school programs : the impact of declining enrolments, collective agreements, and regulations / principal investigators: John E. Davis, Doris W. Ryan. --

"This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario."

1. Education, Secondary - Ontario. 2. School management and organization - Ontario. I. Ryan, Doris W. II. Ontario. Ministry of Education. III. Title.

ON01868 373.713 UTLAS: 54013878

ISBN 0-7743-6071-2

Additional copies may be ordered from:

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

or from:

The Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2

1 2 3 4 5 XX 48 38 28 18 08

Abstract

This study has examined and documented issues in secondary school organization posed by declining enrolments, government legislation, collective agreements and attendant cultural economic and social factors. To do this, information was gathered and analyzed from questionnaires returned by 312 secondary school principals. In-depth interviews were conducted with 30 of this number. As well, relevant legislation, regulations, and the series of H.S.1 circulars from 1972 to 1980 were reviewed. Finally, documents from the Education Relations Commission of Ontario were used to compile a synopsis of constraints placed upon school organization and timetabling by clauses in collective agreements.

The data show that size of school is clearly related to school program. Small schools have traditionally offered a fundamentally academic program with few technical, vocational or commercial subjects. The necessity of providing core courses at various levels of difficulty further limits the number of options small schools can offer. But the policy change to compulsory subjects in Grades 9 and 10 has probably had little effect on them, in view of the limitations under which these schools have always had to operate. Effects of that policy will undoubtedly be felt more severely in schools with present enrolments of from 600 to 1,500, because they have made the most visible attempts to provide a wide range of course options.

Declining enrolments have created conditions under which great numbers of teachers have been declared surplus or redundant. Consequently, many schools lack the staff with qualifications necessary to

maintain a full range of courses and programs. As the percentage of Ontario secondary schools in the under-400 category rises during this decade the present plight of small schools will be experienced by ever increasing numbers of schools. The impact of collective agreements upon program varies from school to school and from board to board, but the general effect has been to restrict the extent of program flexibility which schools once enjoyed.

Principals interviewed during the course of the study suggested that many traditional senior level academic courses will give way to newer courses such as Man in Society and People and Politics. Problems in offering a choice of difficulty levels will likely result in a reduction of basic and modified level programs and in the increasing use of the educationally undesirable "open" level courses. The principals also indicated that collective agreements may possibly shape the nature of school programs to an even greater extent than do student needs. Ministry regulations and priorities were perceived by approximately one-quarter of the principals as having a negative effect upon the range of optional course offerings.

The study concludes that secondary school organization will be affected by the interaction of decline, teacher-negotiated restrictions, and by societal expectations expressed in Ministry policy and regulations. Unless the organization and delivery of secondary school programs change, the end result will be a reduction in the nature and kinds of educational opportunities offered to young people. To try to offset this outcome, several kinds of program alternatives are suggested for consideration at the school, system, and Ministry levels. Some of these involve use of recent technological discoveries. Others depend upon the formulation of new education policies. All demand creative thinking and a large measure of cooperation amongst the various institutions involved. Indeed, "creativity" and "cooperation" may well be the watchwords of educationists in the decade ahead.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation to the 66 school boards and 312 secondary school principals who participated in this study. Special thanks are extended to the 30 principals who also graciously consented to be interviewed as part of the data gathering process. Many of these persons travelled considerable distances in order to make themselves available.

Martha Schmidt and Ellen Berry very capably handled the extensive and necessary data processing. Rachel Donaghy was responsible for the efficient distribution of questionnaires and for arranging interviews throughout the province. Tillie Helm coordinated the final preparation of the manuscript, ably assisted by Betty Berner. David Eaton read an early draft of the document and made several suggestions for its revision. Ministry of Education officials not only supervised the study but provided a great deal of useful information and advice. We sincerely thank all these people for their assistance.

John E. Davis

Doris W. Ryan

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION: SCOPE, PROCEDURES, AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT 1

2 CONSTRAINTS ON SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAM ORGANIZATION 10

- Circular H.S.1 12
  - Course and Credit Requirements for Secondary School Graduation 12
  - Curriculum Guidelines 20
  - Special Programs 23
    - Co-operative Education 23
    - Training Credits (Linkage Program) 24
    - Occupations Programs 25
    - Special Education 26
  - Course Approval 27
  - Textbook Approval 29
- Government Legislation and Regulations 30
- Teacher-Board Collective Agreements 32
  - Pupil-Teacher Ratios 33
  - Instructional Load 38
  - Class Size 43
  - Teacher Surplus/Redundancy 46
- Summary 47
- Discussion 48

3 SECONDARY SCHOOLS ON THE EVE OF DECLINE 52

- School Characteristics 54
  - Language of Instruction 54
  - Grade Levels 55
  - Levels of Instruction 56
- Extent of Decline 61
- Organizational and Program Changes During the Last Five Years 66
  - Reasons for Program and Organizational Changes 70
  - Discussion of Organization and Program Changes 71
- Decline in Enrolments in Particular Courses During the Past Five Years 82

Reasons for Declines in Enrolment in Particular Courses or Subjects 84

- Cooperation with Other Organizations 89
- Summary 94
- Discussion 98

4 THE IMPACTS OF DECLINING ENROLMENTS, COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS, AND GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS AND PRIORITIES ON SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION 103

- The Impact of Declining Enrolments 104
  - Elimination of Courses 108
  - Combining Grade Levels and Difficulty Levels 113
  - School Closure 120
- The Impact of Collective Agreements 123
  - Pupil-Teacher Ratio 128
  - Class Size 131
  - Teacher Workload 137
  - Teacher Surplus and Redundancy 144
- The Impact of Government Regulations and Priorities 154
  - Circular H.S.1 158
    - The Credit System 158
    - Definition of a Credit 164
    - Compulsory Subjects (Credits) 167
    - Difficulty Levels 171
    - Curriculum Guidelines 174
  - Legislation and Regulations 177
    - School Finance 177
    - Teacher Qualifications 181
    - Teacher Strikes 186
  - Current and Future Priorities 188
    - School-to-Work Programs 188
    - Special Education 193
    - Program Interface and Articulation 197
- Summary and Discussion 201

5 PROGRAM ORGANIZATION IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS 212

- Approaches in Other Canadian Provinces 212
  - British Columbia 212
  - Alberta 214
  - Saskatchewan 217

10

Manitoba 218

The Maritime Provinces 220

Newfoundland 221

Small Secondary Schools: The American Context 221

Instructional Materials 223

• Discussion 224

Problems 226

Organization of the School System as a Whole 226

Organization of Programs Within Each School 226

Modification of Existing Programs 227

Use of Human and Instructional Resources 227

Solutions 228

Ingenuity and Creative Thinking 228

Wide-scale Cooperation 228

Appropriate Use of Technology 228

Conclusions 229

• A Case Study 230

6 IMPLICATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES 245

• School-Oriented Strategies 245

Policy 245

Personnel 246

Community-Based Programs 246

School-Based Community Programs 247

Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices 248

Experimental Courses 248

Climate 249

• System-Oriented Strategies 249

Policy 249

Personnel 251

Community-Based Programs 251

School-Based Community Programs 251

Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices 252

Experimental Courses 254

Climate 254

- Ministry of Education Assistance 255
  - Policy 255
  - Personnel 256
  - Community-Based Programs 256
  - School-Based Community Programs 257
  - Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices 257
  - Experimental Courses 260
  - Climate 260
- Discussion 262

Appendix A: Questionnaires for Secondary School Principals 263

Appendix B: Collective Agreements Containing Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Instructional Load, Class Size, and Surplus/Redundancy Provisions Related to School Program 266

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Survey Participation of School Boards by Region	5
2	Survey Participation of Secondary Schools by Region	6
3	Survey Participation of Secondary Schools by Size of School	7
4	Requirements for the Secondary School Graduation Diploma, 1974-1981	18
5	Provision of Clauses Related to Class Size, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, and Instructional Load in Collective Agreements with Secondary School Teachers, 1975-1980	34
6	Summary of Content of Collective Agreement Clauses Related to Pupil-Teacher Ratios	37
7	Summary of Content of Collective Agreement Clauses Related to Instructional Load	39
8	Negotiated Limitations on Teaching Assignments and Allowance for Preparation Time	40
9	Stipulated Pupil-Teacher Contacts in Ten Agreements	42
10	Summary of Clauses in Collective Agreements Related to Class Size	45
11	Ontario Secondary Schools by Size and Region	53
12	Secondary School Programs: Grade Levels Offered by Size of School	56
13	Secondary School Programs: Levels of Instruction by Size of School	58
14	Secondary School Programs: Combinations of Levels of Instruction by Size of School	60
15	Secondary School Enrolment Patterns over Five School Years (1975-76 through 1979-80)	62
16	Organizational and Program Changes Made (1975-76 through 1979-80)	69
17	Reasons for Program and Organizational Changes Introduced (1975-76 through 1979-80)	71
18	Trends in Enrolment Decline in Particular Subject Areas (1975-76 through 1979-80)	83
19	Reasons for Decline in Particular Courses or Subjects	85
20	Cooperative Programs in Secondary Schools	90
21	Collective Agreement Clauses Affecting School Programs (1975-76 through 1979-80)	123
22	Effects of Ministry Regulations on School Program (1975-76 through 1979-80)	157

1 Introduction: Scope, Procedures, and Organization of the Report

Probably at no time during this century has the task of the secondary school principal been so Herculean in scope. During the 1970's, schools were confronted very visibly with challenges associated with changes in the social, economic, and cultural milieu. Many of the challenges came in the format of shifting curricular and scheduling requirements issued to schools by the Government and its Ministry of Education. The current expectations require a school organization capable of providing an array of courses at different levels of difficulty in order to accommodate various levels of ability. Moreover, these courses are to be provided in four different areas of study and must include nine required courses. They are to be designed with regard for the cultural, economic, and social setting of the school and should permit each student's program to reflect his or her state of development and expectations of achievement. In the recent past, school administrators have also been called upon to adjust to staffing formulae and other restrictions specified in collective agreements. For small high schools, and especially for those in isolated communities, these continuous challenges have posed enormous difficulties.

Secondary schools, during the decade of the 1980's, not only must meet new requirements set by the Government and the Ministry in response to changes in societal expectations and concerns and adjust to staffing and workload formulae that are negotiated, but the schools must also cope with a factor that exacerbates the impact of the others--that of declining enrolments. Over the next five years or so, secondary schools will have to adapt not only to changes in student enrolments but also to the accompanying declines in material resources, in personnel, in facilities, in morale, and in program. Paradoxically, one important factor is not in decline--the expectations that parents and the public hold for secondary education. Ontario residents have been justifiably proud of the quality of their secondary education system. As those responsible for shaping secondary education grapple with the difficulties of the 1980's, they need to be guided by a full awareness of the various factors and issues impinging on program organization and program delivery. It is to the delineation of those issues that this study is addressed.

Scope of the Study

In 1979, the Minister of Education contracted with The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education to examine and document issues in secondary school organization posed by declining enrolments, government legislation, collective agreements, and attendant cultural, economic, and social factors. According to the terms of reference, the study was to:

(1) examine and document legislation and regulations which govern the managerial role of the Ontario secondary school principal and affect program organization;

(2) examine and make a synopsis of collective agreements which affect the program organization of Ontario secondary schools;

(3) survey all Ontario secondary schools in order to gather information about:

    (a) changes in organizational patterns brought about by declining enrolments

(b) alternative approaches to program organization within both the school and the system

(c) the effects upon program of legislation and regulations

(d) the effects upon program of Ministry policy statements (contained in numbered memoranda) as perceived by school officials

(e) the effects upon program of collective agreements;

(4) where appropriate, gather similar information from other jurisdictions; and

(5) prepare a handbook of information and suggestions based upon the data collected through items (1) through (4) above, differentiating between the program issues of large and small secondary schools.

Research Procedures

A variety of data-gathering techniques was used in order to meet the terms of reference for the study. Relevant legislation, regulations, and the series of H.S.1 circulars from 1972 to 1980 were reviewed from the standpoint of constraints placed upon secondary school administration and program organization. From information and documents supplied by the Education Relations Commission of Ontario, a synopsis was made of constraints placed on school organization and timetabling by clauses in collective agreements.

A short questionnaire was developed for a survey of secondary school principals. (A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A). The questionnaire sought background information about school program, language of instruction, enrolment across five years, and the like. As well, principals were asked to provide information about courses in which enrolment was declining, about effects on their school of government legislation and regulations and collective agreements, about actual or anticipated changes in their school organization, and about alternative ways of meeting the challenges of declining resources and enrolments.

A copy of the questionnaire was sent to the chief executive officer for each of 175 school boards in Ontario. Their permission was requested for the research team to send the questionnaire to the high school principals in their jurisdictions. Permission was received from nearly all of the boards, and questionnaires were mailed to high school principals.

Principals from 66 school boards in the province returned the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the distribution, by region, of school boards and the number and percentage of boards from which responses were received from secondary school principals.

On the whole, the response rate is far higher than what one usually expects from a mailed questionnaire. The returns from the Midnorthern and Northeastern regions are considerably lower than those from the other regions, which suggests that the responses may not be completely representative of provincial school boards. However, they are representative of the provincial secondary schools, as we shall see.

Table 1

Survey Participation of School Boards by Region

Region	Number of Boards	Number of Boards with Secondary Schools	Number of Boards Participating	Percentage of Boards Participating[a,b]
Central	45	28	26	93%
Eastern	20	10	9	90%
Midnorthern	26	9	5	56%
Northeastern	28	11	6	55%
Northwestern	35	9	9	100%
Western	21	12	11	92%
TOTALS	175	79	66	84%

---

[a] That is, Boards with secondary schools.

[b] Percentages are rounded.

From among the participating boards, a total of 312 secondary school principals returned the questionnaires by the due-date. (A few responses were received after the deadline, but the analyses in this report are based upon the 312). Table 2 reports the number of secondary schools in the province, by region, and the number and percentage of schools from which questionnaire responses were received.

Table 2

Survey Participation of Secondary Schools by Region

Region	Number of Secondary Schools[a]	Number of Schools Participating	Percentage of Schools Participating[b]
Central	287	176	61%
Eastern	78	39	50%
Midnorthern	33	17	52%
Northeastern	27	12	44%
Northwestern	24	18	75%
Western	93	50	54%
TOTALS	542	312	58%

[a] Excludes junior high schools and some special schools.

[b] Percentages are rounded.

It is clear from Table 2 that more than half of all Ontario secondary schools are located in the Central Region of the province. The number of secondary schools from each region that participated in the survey roughly parallels their proportion across the province. Further, responses were received from at least half of the high school principals in five of the six regions. Thus, we are confident that the sample for the questionnaire survey is representative of the province's secondary schools.

Provincial secondary schools were classified by size into three categories. Small high schools were defined as those with student enrolments up to 599 students. Schools having a student enrolment of from 600 to 1499 were classified as being of medium size. Large schools were designated as those with a student enrolment of 1500 or more. As Table 3 shows, questionnaire responses were received from over half the schools in each size category. Small schools were slightly over-represented; this may be explained by their greater concern with a study examining constraints on program organization and delivery. Because the number of schools classified as of medium size was quite large, this category was further divided into Medium Small and Medium Large for purposes of many of the analyses reported in Chapter 3.

Table 3

Survey Participation of Secondary Schools by Size of School

	Size of School			
	Small (up to 599)	Medium (600-1499)	Large (1500 or more)	TOTAL
Number of Schools in the province	87	389	66	542
Number of Schools participating	63	211	38	312
Percentage of Schools participating	72%	54%	58%	58%

In responding to the questionnaires, principals were asked if they would be willing to participate in follow-up studies of schools facing declining enrolment or program restraints due to school size. The names of schools from which the principal had agreed to participate further were first sorted according to provincial regions. Further sortings were done with respect to size of school (i.e. student enrolment) and extent of decline.

Thirty principals were selected to meet in small groups for interviews. Three of the group interviews were held in Toronto, two were held in London, and the others were conducted in Kingston, Thunder Bay, and St. Catharines. The interviews allowed principals to speak more fully about the issues addressed in the questionnaire, to describe other problems not identified in the questionnaire, and to share their ideas about alternative solutions to the problems. The discussion in Chapters 3 and 5 include our analyses of the interview data.

One of the principal investigators, Dr. John Davis, corresponded with provincial curriculum officials in several other provinces and made site visits to some provinces. These contacts yielded useful information and ideas about secondary school program organization and delivery in the context of already small schools and those facing declining enrolments.

Finally, Dr. Davis served on a team charged with conducting a study of the secondary schools in the Lake Superior Board of Education. Their in-depth study of the problems faced by this Northern board provided invaluable sensitivity to the problems of small, geographically isolated high schools as well as a testing-ground for the feasibility of solutions to these problems.

Organization of the Report

The focus of Chapter 2 is a discussion of Government regulations and guidelines and of collective agreements as they relate to the concerns of secondary school program administration. The chapter sets the stage for understanding the impact of these factors--an impact that has already been felt by schools during the 1970's, and that will be felt even more strongly during the 1980's as schools enter the era of declining enrolment. Chapter 3 presents information about secondary school situations, changes in organization and program, and changes in course enrolments during the recent past. Decline itself will occur unevenly among the province's secondary schools. Further, the schools already differ in characteristics such as size, organization, type of program, and type of community served. Thus, Chapter 3 provides contextual information by means of which one may anticipate the variation in impact that decline will pose for different schools.

Chapter 4 describes the types of changes in organization and program that secondary school principals anticipate because of the interaction of declining enrolments, collective agreements, Government regulations and societal priorities for secondary education in the 1980's. The chapter draws heavily from information collected during interviews with principals. For schools now experiencing decline, the impacts described are already being felt; for others, they are anticipated during the next few years. Chapter 5 addresses possible solutions to the problems of Ontario secondary schools in decline. It presents a discussion of alternatives and innovations being tried in other jurisdictions, and a case study of the secondary schools within one school board. The implications of the study for the provincial Government and its Ministry of Education, for school board trustees and officials and for secondary school principals and staffs are discussed in Chapter 6.

2 Constraints on Secondary School Program Organization

Within the last decade, many organizational changes have taken place in the secondary schools of Ontario. In 1972, all high schools were required by the provincial Ministry of Education to shift to a credit system with subject rather than grade promotion. An important aspect of the new system was the absence of required subjects. Schools were expected to introduce individualized timetables so that, with the approval of parents, students could select their own programs, choosing courses from four broad areas of study. Throughout the 1970's, the Ministry's H.S.1 Circulars (which outline diploma requirements) encouraged secondary school principals and teachers to provide an array of courses at different levels of difficulty to accommodate differences in student interests and abilities. In response, many schools began to experiment with innovative forms of organization and to address the expectation for variety in curricular offerings. (See the monographs in the H.S.1 Series, The Individualized System, such as Ryan (1974) and Leithwood (1974), for documentation.)

Ministry regulations reflect societal expectations, societal concerns, and political expediencies. As these contextual factors change, the regulations are modified accordingly. When the public became concerned about the quality of secondary education in a totally individualized structure, the Ministry moved in the late 1970's to require high school graduates to earn credits in each of several core subject areas: English, mathematics, science, Canadian history and Canadian geography.

The return to required credits created problems for some schools that had adopted innovative organizations (see Ryan, in press, for a case study of the Hillcrest High School experiences). At the same time that secondary schools had to ensure that their organizational structures provided opportunities for students to meet graduation requirements, the schools were still expected to meet individual student needs in terms of breadth and depth of program offerings. Currently, schools are being encouraged to expand their vocational and technical programs and to develop co-operative education programs in order to create more viable linkages from school to work. There is also an emerging priority for increases in special education programs.

The decade of the 1970's brought additional challenges to the province's secondary schools. Teachers gained the right to strike, and collective agreements began to define and delimit the teacher workload. Negotiated workloads and staffing formulae are now placing constraints on school timetabling and programming. As the era of declining enrolments approached, collective agreements began to include clauses or policies related to teacher surplus and redundancy. Since the procedures are largely to be based upon seniority, there are implications for school program.

The changes that have occurred during the 1970's in Government and Ministry requirements for secondary schools are described in the first section of this chapter. The discussion examines course and credit requirements for high school graduation, curriculum guidelines (including the provision of special programs such as co-operative education, training credits or linkage, occupations, and special education), and procedures for course and textbook approval. Government legislation and regulations are examined in the second section, with special attention paid to Regulation 704. Finally, current teacher-board collective agreements are analyzed as they relate to pupil-teacher ratios, instructional workload, class size, and teacher surplus or redundancy. The discussions in this chapter, then, provide a contextual background for understanding the full impact of decline as a factor that makes it even more difficult for schools to respond to societal and professional expectations. The impact of these factors during a decade of declining enrolments will be examined in Chapter 4.

Circular H.S.1

Government requirements for the awarding of diplomas to secondary school students are given in Circular H.S.1, which is issued periodically. In the interim between the issuance of one circular and a new one, changes are specified in numbered memoranda sent from the Minister to school officials. Circular H.S.1 is the secondary school principal's guidebook. Not only does the document impinge on school organization, but it also provides restrictions related to curricular content, course development, textbook approval, and special situations (e.g. occupations programs, French-language schools, and co-operative education programs).

Course and Credit Requirements for Secondary School Graduation

The beginning of the credit system in Ontario Secondary schools was prescribed by Circular H.S.1: 1972-73. This document required changes in student timetabling and scheduling and in distribution of courses into four broad areas of studies (communications, social and environmental studies, pure and applied sciences, and arts). Beyond meeting the requirements, schools were encouraged to introduce many more far-reaching changes (see Ryan, 1974). The document stated that students could be awarded the Secondary School Graduation Diploma (SSGD) by successfully earning at least one credit from each of the four areas of study in each of the student's first two years in a secondary school (8 credits), at least one further credit after the first two years from each of the four areas of study (4 credits), and a further 15 credits. Students in French-language schools, however, were required to take English or Anglais (according to Section 56 of the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1970). To be awarded the Secondary School Honour Graduation Diploma (SSHGD), the student must earn 6 credits in courses approved for study in Grade 13.

A credit was normally granted to a student who successfully completed a course for which a minimum of 110 hours had been scheduled. This had definite implications for secondary school organization. Recognizing that certain organizational patterns such as semester or trimester or summer school systems might create units of work which equal less than a full credit, H.S.1: 1972-73 stated that courses leading to the SSGD might carry less than a full credit. In order "to ensure a minimal depth of study in Honour Diploma work" (p.6), however, the document stated that no fractional credit less than one would be accepted for courses leading to the SSHGD.

These requirements were modified only slightly in Circular H.S.1: 1973-74. The restriction on credit earnings during the first two years in secondary school was removed. To earn the SSGD, students simply had to complete at least three credits from each of the four areas of study (12 credits) and a further 15 credits. The discussion on credit values was expanded to include the suggestion that no course have a value of less than 1/3 credit (meaning that school organizations have class periods allowing around 40 hours of instruction over the term or school year). For courses leading to the SSHGD, the circular stated that courses might carry more than one credit but the additional should "extend in time and content one-third or more beyond a single credit" (p.7).

A memorandum issued on November 30, 1973, repeated the Minister's statement to the Legislature on November 15 that "It is not to be left to chance that students acquire a deeper understanding and appreciation of the English language and of Canada itself." The memorandum advised school officials that, beginning in September of 1974, each student entering year one of a secondary school program would be required to complete successfully at least four credits in English studies and at least two credits in Canadian studies in order to be eligible for the SSGD. While students who had already begun secondary school under the previous requirements were excused from the new stipulations, principals were urged to encourage these students to include English studies and Canadian studies in their programs.

Circular H.S.1: 1974-75 incorporated the new requirements for English studies and Canadian studies. Schools were again strongly encouraged to modify organizational structures and curricular offerings to meet individual student needs, abilities, and interests. For courses leading to the SSGD, principals could still offer courses having less than one full credit's value. For the SSHGD, credit value greater than one could still be assigned to courses that met special requirements.

Although the Minister of Education had moved to place at least a limited stipulation on student choice of program, no specific courses were required. There was some flexibility for the school principal and staff in classifying courses as being Canadian studies or English studies and in developing the content of such courses. A memorandum of January 31, 1975, informed school principals that emphasis in English studies should be placed on functional use of the language rather than on theoretical application of rules. A basic component of such courses, according to the memorandum, would be sufficient practice in writing and assistance from the teacher "to encourage all students to develop the competence in expression of which they are capable." Courses in Canadian literature could be designated both as English studies and Canadian studies, but a student would be able to count the credit for only one of the two requirements. These stipulations have remained in effect through the various H.S.1 documents since 1975.

During the period 1972-76, the Minister was under pressure both from lay persons and from secondary school teachers to introduce required subjects as a condition for the granting of the SSGD. (See Ryan, 1977, for a summary of the "rise and demise" of the individualized system). Accordingly, in memoranda of October 20 and November 8, 1976, the Minister gave advance notice of the significant changes that were incorporated subsequently in H.S. 1: 1977-78. All students entering a secondary school program on or after September 1, 1977, "shall, within their program during the first two years, include courses in required subjects" as follows:

English--2 credits
Mathematics--2 credits
Science--1 credit
Canadian History (1 credit) and Canadian Geography (1 credit)
 or Canadian History--2 credits

Students were still required to take an additional two credits in English studies, making the total required credits to be nine. A footnote explained that principals were required to ensure that Canadian Geography was available to students as an option.

The 1977-78 circular noted that "It is expected that each required subject will be offered at different levels of difficulty to accommodate the varying needs and abilities of the students in each school." The nine required credits were to be earned as part of the restriction of at least three credits from each of the four areas of study and a further 15 credits from any of the four areas of study. The definition of a credit remained unchanged.

On December 22, 1977, the Minister of Education issued a memorandum stating that Circular H.S.1: 1977-78 would remain in effect for the 1978-79 school year with one major change. Students entering a secondary school program on or after September 1, 1978, were to be required to earn one credit in Canadian History and one credit in Canadian Geography as two of the requirements in the core curriculum program. The option of taking a second history course in lieu of a course in Canadian Geography was removed.

The SSGD graduation requirements were changed again in Circular H.S.1: 1979-81. The requirement for two credits in English studies was replaced by a requirement that students earn an additional two Senior Division credits in English. The SSHGD requirements were changed so that students who began to enrol in Grade 13 courses after September 1, 1979, could receive a restricted number of credits in each subject. The circular listed the credit restrictions. The new requirements of 1979 were subsequently extended to include the 1981-82 school year.

The 1979-81 circular recommended that the various secondary school courses be offered at one or more of the following levels of difficulty: modified (e.g. skills-oriented courses), basic (e.g. basic knowledge and skills and remedial work), general (including technical and business courses), and advanced (including enriched work). The circular recognized that schools might offer many courses at only one level, but schools were especially encouraged to offer the required subjects at two or more levels, since their successful completion was necessary to earn a diploma. A later memorandum (September 24, 1979) clarified that the four levels had been recommended to provide uniform nomenclature across the province, but added that the adoption of these names for levels was optional and that open level courses might be offered where desirable.

The 1979-81 circular also recognized that constraints imposed by numbers of students, financial considerations, and availability of staff might require schools to offer some multi-level classes, in which some students might earn credits at one level and others might earn credits at an adjacent level of difficulty. It was recommended that such classes not involve more than two levels in the same grade and in the same subject.

In summary, there have been at least five major changes in requirements for the granting of secondary school graduation diplomas during the decade of the 1970's. The following table summarizes four of these changes, each of which was made after the initial, most far-reaching change in 1972 to the credit system itself and to the absence, at that time, of compulsory subjects. Table 4 illustrates how important it is for schools to keep an accounting of the entry date of each student, since the graduation requirements that apply to each student vary with date of entry into a secondary school program. There are also special considerations to be taken into account for students in occupations programs (see discussion in the next section).

Despite the shifts leading from no compulsory subjects to a total of nine required credits, the basic philosophy of the government regarding secondary education has been relatively consistent throughout the 1970's. This philosophy, as expressed in the most recent H.S.1

circular (1979-81) is as follows:

> In so far as it is consistent with the financial and human resources available in a school, secondary school organization should allow each student to pursue a program suited to his or her individual needs and aspirations. The organization of a secondary school curriculum that permits individualized progress for students requires time, energy, and dedication. Various organizational patterns, which may have distinct advantages in particular situations, may also impose special demands on principals, teachers, and students. If many individual differences are to be accommodated within courses, there must be careful and perceptive adaptation of curriculum guidelines, a constant awareness of standards, a flexible organizational structure, and, for exceptional students, supportive special education services. (p. 4)

Table 4

Requirements for the Secondary School Graduation Diploma, 1974-1981

(Source: Circular H.S.1: 1979-81)

Minimum number of credits	School year in which the student began or will begin the first year of a secondary school program			
	1974-75 1975-76 1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80 1980-81
for an SSGD including, within this total, the following:	27	27	27	27
from each area of study	3	3	3	3
from English studies	4	2	2	
from Canadian studies	2			
in required subjects:				
Intermediate Division				
English (or Anglais)		2	2	2
Mathematics		2	2	2
Science		1	1	1
Canadian History			1	1
Canadian Geography			1	1
Canadian History OR Canadian History and Canadian Geography		2 OR 1 each		
Senior Division				
English (or Anglais)				2

The new push towards business and technological education is evident in a section of H.S.1: 1979-81. Secondary schools are encouraged to provide courses that would enable students who plan to enter the work force directly after leaving high school to acquire applicable skills in these areas and a good vocational perspective. As well, secondary schools are encouraged to provide courses to prepare students who wish to specialize in business and technological programs at a college of applied arts and technology or other post-secondary institutions. Thus, business and technological programs are supposed to offer diversity in content, function, and approach.

These are among many changes in recommendations that are coming forth as Ontario secondary schools enter the 1980's. Another emerging priority seems to be in the area of co-operative education, which is discussed later. The H.S.1 circular (1979-81) also states that it is inappropriate for any school to deny access to a course or a program solely on the basis of the sex of the student. While mixed classes of males and females are not obligatory, students of either sex must be free to participate in courses in all available subject areas. A final major change is approaching in the area of special education (see the discussion below).

Studies following the introduction of the credit system in 1972 had shown that most Ontario secondary school students continued to enrol in "core" courses prior to the Minister's decision to make these compulsory (see the H.S.1 Studies published by OISE; also see Ryan, 1975). Thus, the 1977 change in diploma requirements would not have caused undue difficulties in program accommodation in most schools. However, some schools had introduced innovative scheduling organizations (e.g. varying period lengths) which would make it unlikely for students to complete the required credits in the first two years, even though they would have taken the required courses (see Ryan, in press). Further, the recommendation to offer the required courses at various levels of difficulty has caused some problems as schools are confronted with declining enrolments. The new push towards business and technological programs, the new legislation regarding special education, and the new emphasis on co-operative education will place demands on schools for program accommodation. These effects are discussed in Chapter 3.

Curriculum Guidelines

The early 1970's was not only a time in which secondary schools were encouraged to experiment with flexible scheduling organizations, but it was also a time in which local curriculum development was stressed. Circular H.S.1: 1972-73, for example, stated that "Curriculum guidelines issued by the (then) Department provide the framework within which courses of study are to be developed at the local level to meet the needs, interests, and aptitudes of the students." Further clarification was offered in H.S.1: 1974-75 by the statement that there were no restrictions on the number of courses leading to the SSGD that could be developed from any one guideline, "as long as all courses reflect the intent and balance described in the guidelines from which they are developed." For many school boards and secondary schools, course development was the order of the day.

There were more restrictions placed on the development of courses leading to the SSHGD. Because these courses provide a basis for university level education, the Ministry required the maintenance of "depth of study and intellectual demands" in them. Thus, the content of most honour graduation guidelines was more specifically described, and the credit value was fixed within more definite limits.

Limitations were placed also on the number of such courses that could be developed from a particular guideline, with approval by the Ministry required for any deviations. Honour graduation courses for a single credit could be developed from 11 guidelines,[1] while courses for a maximum of two credits could be developed from 10 guidelines in the area of languages (Anglais, English, Français, French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin and Greek, Russian and Spanish). In mathematics, a maximum of four credits (one for each) could be developed for relations and functions, calculus, algebra, and mathematics of investment.

The government continued to emphasize local curriculum development through the early years of the 1970's. A memorandum of August 22, 1975, for example, specified aspects of the Ministry's general curriculum policy. Local curriculum development must involve as many practising teachers and principals as possible. The development, classroom application, supervision and evaluation of curriculum are responsibilities of supervisory officers. "While the Ministry strongly endorses the wide-spread involvement of principals and teachers in local curriculum development, their involvement, as in the case of their other professional duties, is under the authority of local supervisory officers."

The tide had turned by late 1976, both in terms of provincial specification of a required core of subjects and in terms of a more centralized role in curricular development. A memorandum of January 19, 1977, stated:

---

[1] The guidelines for single credit included accountancy, art, biology, chemistry, economic reasoning, geography, history, home economics, music, physics, and secretarial practice.

> It is recognized that, over the past several years, many school boards and many educators have invested a great deal of time and money in local curriculum development activities. Much good work has been done, which is a great credit to all of those concerned.
>
> However, in our decision to take a firmer hand in curriculum development, we felt that the Ministry of Education should assist to a greater degree in this endeavour, in order to avoid inconsistencies and variations in standard and content. Therefore, the curriculum materials that will be produced at the provincial level will henceforth be more prescriptive and descriptive, and provide a solid base upon which local development can build.

The memorandum noted that the five Intermediate Division guidelines which were then being re-written and expanded (for English, history, geography, science and mathematics) could serve as examples. Each guideline was to contain a core of common elements which must be included in all courses. However, appropriate allowances were to be made so that courses of varying levels of difficulty could be offered "to accommodate the varying needs and abilities of all the students in each school."

A policy statement issued as a supplement to Circular H.S.1: 1977-78,and now incorporated into that document, provides guidelines for the planning of credit courses that involve out-of-school learning components. Courses taught or studied outside the framework of a curriculum guideline were to require approval. In cases where the out-of-school component takes the form of a practical application of in-school learning (as opposed to independent study), the in-school component must form at least one-third of the course (or approximately 40 hours of each credit assigned to the course). It was recommended that the number of credits involving out-of-school time should not be restricted. However, in the case of co-operative work experience and community involvement programs containing extensive out-of-school work components, students should be advised to limit their involvement to one school year, with two years being the absolute maximum. Finally, any credit that was to have an out-of-school component must be based on local outlines of criteria approved by the school board or must be given special approval by the supervisory officer.

Special Programs

Co-operative Education. An entire section of Circular H.S.1: 1979-81 was devoted to Co-operative Education which allows students to obtain credits through courses that combine in-school and out-of-school components. The demands that Co-operative Education courses place on secondary schools is illustrated by the following statements in the circular:

> The structure of both the in-school and out-of-school components is the responsibility of the teacher. Therefore, it must be recognized that any course or set of courses in co-operative education can make considerable demands on the time of the teacher as well as on that of the out-of-school supervisor or employer.
>
> The proposed learning must be outlined and approved, the resources identified, and all of the evaluative criteria co-operatively determined in advance and subsequently monitored. These are legitimate demands on a teacher's time and need to be accommodated in the organization of the school program.
>
> Courses having an out-of-school component are to be based on a curriculum guideline or treated as experimental courses for which Ministry approval is required.
>
> In order that a co-operative education course be eligible for credit, the out-of school work must be very closely related to the in-school studies and must reflect co-operative planning between outside instructors and in-school staff. Such courses must be carefully monitored by the school if they are to remain eligible for credit.
>
> A teacher on the school staff, knowledgeable in the area under study, must: (a) identify the objectives for the out-of-school component and approve the learning strategies planned to achieve them; (b) work co-operatively with outside supervisors in planning and evaluating student learning and in orienting the student to work situations; (c) visit and monitor the out-of-school activities to ensure that course expectations are met; and (d) evaluate the

> student's performance and the worth of out-of-school activities.
>
> Advisory committees (consisting of representatives from community groups, parents, employers, representatives from labour and educators) should be established to maintain the links required between the school and the community and should be involved in planning and evaluation of programs. (pp. 18-19)

It is easy to see how secondary school principals have difficulty scheduling teacher time to accomplish all these tasks with reference to as few as one student. Staff reductions due to declining enrolments, coupled with workload clauses in collective agreements, provide real constraints within which principals must meet the provisions for co-operative education programs. The principals' views on this issue are presented in Chapter 3.

Training Credits (Linkage Program). A memorandum of July 2, 1980, announced that courses leading to training credits had been initiated in 140 secondary schools during the 1979-80 school year. Over 15,000 secondary school students are now participating in courses related to one of eight trade areas that were identified in the original program announcement (Memorandum 1978-79:34). The July 1980 memorandum announced the addition of a ninth trade area, that of Motor Vehicle Mechanic.

The Training Credit Program (often called the Linkage Program) is jointly sponsored by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. The objectives are to provide secondary school students with appropriate skills to enter a trade and to minimize overlaps in training for those who do. The program enables students to acquire, in their secondary school courses, the same skills and knowledge normally covered in the initial in-school course of the provincial apprenticeship or modular training program. Training profiles list in detail the performance objectives for each trade. When the objectives listed for any in-school course associated with the trades are achieved, the student acquires a training credit that is recognized when he or she enters that trade.

Occupations Programs. According to Circular H.S.1: 1972-73, occupations programs leading to a Certificate of Training should normally have a 50-50 balance of general and practical courses, with exceptions in individual cases. The document cautioned that students in such programs must have the opportunity to select their programs from the full range of offerings available at the school. Selection of courses should not be restrictive toward either sex, but dependent mainly upon student interest and ability.

When required subjects were specified in H.S.1: 1977-78 for the awarding of the SSGD, a memorandum was issued on March 11, 1977, with regard to occupations programs, leading either to a Certificate of Training or to the SSGD. For those programs, the required subjects policy was modified as follows: (1) a minimum of 4 credits in the required subjects, two of which must be in English, must be included during Grades 9 and 10 of occupations programs; (2) principals were encouraged to arrange for more than the minimum 4 credits in the required subjects where it was feasible; and (3) the principal must ensure that the remaining required subjects were available in subsequent years for students proceeding to the SSGD since all required subjects must be successfully completed before the SSGD could be issued. These requirements remain in effect in the most recent H.S.1 circular.

Course credit values were addressed in Circular H.S.1: 1977-78. In the first two years of occupational education, the decision as to whether a course is to be assigned credit value is to be made by the principal in consultation with his staff. The circular stated, however, that students must be given the opportunity to accumulate credits by the beginning of their third year after leaving the Junior Division, by which time all their courses would be eligible for credit. A memorandum of January 21, 1977, noted that in occupations programs where driving a vehicle was an integral part of that occupation, the Ministry of Education would recognize a Driver Education course for full credit (110 hours in-class and in-car) or for half-credit (55 hours in-class and in-car).

Special Education. A section on exceptional students re-appears in Circular H.S.1: 1979-81 and provides an overview of the emerging philosophy of the government regarding special education. Traditionally, the document states, schools have met the needs of such students through a wide range of special educational services and through special occupational and vocational courses. In contrast, the "present" philosophy is stated as choosing appropriate programs "from a range encompassing integration within the regular program to segregation for those students who require an intensive program" (p. 8).

In accordance with the new philosophy, schools are told to design courses at appropriate levels for exceptional students with learning problems in such subjects as English, mathematics, science, history, geography, visual arts, music, family studies, and physical and health education. The need continues, the document states, for specially designed courses to provide practical training in preparation for specific occupational and vocational goals. "Further, appropriate programs for four years' duration should be available for all students who want or need them" (p. 8).

The circular states that the planning of such programs may require:

> special provisions within a regular class, with or without special resource support; special class grouping on a full or part-time basis; the grouping of numbers of students within a special-purpose secondary school; or any combination of these approaches. However, there will still be students in all schools for whom special courses, instructional techniques, learning materials, and evaluation processes will be necessary. It is particularly important that the instruction of these students be assigned to teachers who have an understanding of their special needs, a willingness to meet the challenge of teaching exceptional students, and a commitment to the objectives of the courses. The number of students in each class should be consistent with the objectives of a special education program and should follow the stipulations set forth in the O. Reg. 704/78, Elementary and Secondary Schools and Schools for Trainable Retarded Children -- General (p. 8).

Again, it is easy to anticipate the difficulties that principals might face in scheduling and timetabling staff to accommodate the philosophy of mainstreaming, where possible, and of assigning teachers who meet the criteria to classes of the class size stipulated in the regulations.

Course Approval

The H.S.1 circulars issued during the 1970's specified some changes in the process and terms of approval for courses developed by local jurisdictions. H.S.1: 1972-73 stated that new or experimental courses not included in the rationale of existing (then) Department Guidelines would require approval for purposes of credit toward a diploma. Approval of courses for credit towards the SSHGD was to be granted on a one-year basis only. The latter was modified in H.S.1: 1973-74 to extend approval for two years. The same document stated that courses leading to the SSGD could be granted approval for an indefinite period unless the letter of approval specified a limitation.

Periodically, memoranda are issued with regard to the easing of restrictions for certain courses. For example, a memorandum of January 2, 1974, gave school boards permission to submit for approval locally developed courses in languages other than those specified earlier. Certain conditions were modified: (1) courses must be confined to the last two years of the Intermediate Division and to the Senior Division; and (2) specific permission to offer the course must be given by the board, prior to submission to the Regional Office of the Ministry for approval. A memorandum of May 20, 1974, was addressed to changes in the policy with regard to the granting of credit for music certificates. While students could count, for credit toward graduation, school music courses as well as music certificates granted by a recognized conservatory or school of music, the levels of acceptable certificates were raised. Further, only one credit for music certificates earned outside the school could be counted toward the SSGD.

Circular H.S.1: 1974-75 added certain restrictions in the matter of course approval. Specific approval had to be sought for courses beyond the credit limits specified in the document, for courses developed from 8 guidelines (which were named) and for courses developed outside the rationale of curriculum guidelines. H.S.1: 1975-76 and 1976-77 expanded the need for course approval to 11 guidelines rather than 8. The guideline list was expanded again in H.S.1: 1977-78 to add two other courses. From the 1975-76 document onward, the period for which approval of a course was to be granted, whether for a specific length of time or for an indefinite period, was to be stated in the letter of approval.

Restrictions were eased in at least two areas during this period. On November 3, 1975, a memorandum was issued to remove the necessity for a board to apply to the Ministry for approval to offer World Religions at the SSGD level. It was also now to be permissible to offer courses in World Religions at the SSHGD level, but approval must be sought for these. A memorandum of July 10, 1978, explained that the specific requirements for the element of French as a language study within extended and immersion programs were not prescribed in Ministry of Education guidelines. Since existing programs had demonstrated that satisfactory levels of language learning were achieved through such program design, authority was granted to exclude immersion and extended courses in French as a second language from the requirement of experimental course approval.

Textbook Approval

Not only must secondary school principals heed the requirements of the Minister and/or Ministry of Education in graduation conditions, curriculum development, and course approval, but they must also abide by requirements for textbook approval. Circular 14, Textbooks, an annual publication issued by the Minister of Education, lists textbooks approved for use in the schools.

Since H.S.1: 1972-73, the policy has been consistent in requiring requests for approval to use textbooks not listed in or covered under Section 5c to be submitted by the chief education officer for a school board to the Regional Director of Education for the attention of the provincial Director of Curriculum. Approval is also required for the use of textbooks for new or experimental courses leading to the SSGD but not for the SSHGD. Where textbooks are to be selected locally (under Section 5c of Circular 14), preference is to be given to books by Canadian authors or editors, printed and bound in Canada. A memorandum of February 3, 1976, clarified that, except in very exceptional cases, boards should not expect permission to be given to use textbooks not listed in Circular 14 when textbooks considered suitable were already listed.

Government Legislation and Regulations

Both the managerial role of the principal and the curricular and scheduling organization in the secondary school are constrained by government legislation and regulations, as well as by numbered memoranda and guidelines. Of particular relevance to secondary school principals are the Education Act (1974) and Regulations 407 and 704/78. Another key piece of legislation is Bill 100, "An Act respecting the Negotiation of Collective Agreements between School Boards and Teachers," which gives teachers the right to strike and permits the negotiation of working conditions.

Because several of the principals whom we interviewed spoke of Regulation 704 as presenting particular constraints in program staffing and timetabling, we prepared a synopsis of some of the major sections as follows:

> Section 12. The principal, subject to the approval of the appropriate supervisory officer, is in charge of the organization of the school. Among duties that are additional to those specified in the Education Act, Section 12 includes making allowance in the timetable for duties required of teachers in charge of organizational units or special programs (e.g., department heads) and for special duties required of any teacher.
>
> Section 15. This part of the regulation specifies that secondary schools shall be organized by departments or similar units and that the board shall appoint a teacher to direct and supervise each organizational unit. Moreover, the school must appoint a teacher to be in charge of a program of business studies, if one is offered, and a teacher to be in charge of a program in technological studies, if one is offered. (Note, from Section 12, that timetable allowances must be made for these special duties.)
>
> Any teachers appointed to direct an organizational unit or a special program shall hold specialist or honour specialist qualifications in one or more of the subjects taught in the relevant unit, and no teacher may be appointed to be in charge of more than one organizational unit.
>
> Section 20. This section, which drew numerous comments during our interviews, stipulates qualifications for teachers of a particular program or subject area. Of especial importance for technological programs is the

regulation that a teacher who does not hold an acceptable university degree (see Regulations 407 and 704/78) shall not be assigned or appointed to teach general studies in a secondary school except for pupils enrolled in an occupational program.

Another part of this section states that no teacher shall be assigned to teach (a range of subject areas are listed) in any of Grades 9-13 in any one school year for more than the time required for two courses that are recognized for credit unless he or she meets certain stipulated qualifications.

The regulation that no teacher could teach in a special education program unless he or she holds qualifications in special education shall not apply to teaching classes in general studies or technological studies in a special vocational or occupations program until September 1, 1981.

Section 35. This section was mentioned often by principals whom we interviewed. It defines maximum class sizes for a variety of kinds of special education classes. Of particular importance is the maximum of 20 pupils in classes in general studies included in a special vocational or occupational program, and the maximum of 16 pupils in classes in technological studies included in a special vocational or occupational program.

(Implementation of the maximum class size provisions was later deferred until after the biennial review which will be completed by June 1980. In announcing the deferral, a memorandum of March 23, 1979, said that it had become apparent that the strict application of these limits to occupational and special vocational classes would cause greater administrative duties than were originally anticipated.)

From time to time, various sections of the Education Act are amended by legislation. One important amendment, announced on July 8, 1978, in a memorandum to school officials, was the provision for a board to enter into an agreement with another board to provide not only accommodation, but also equipment, for administrative and instructional purposes. As enrolments decline, secondary schools may take advantage of this provision as their boards enter "sharing" agreements.

On June 17, 1980, Bill 82 on Special Education received second reading and at the time of writing was being reviewed by the Standing

Committee on Social Development. There are many implications for secondary school organization and timetabling if this bill is enacted. (See the above discussion of special education). For example, the compulsory provision of special education services would create problems for many boards in providing sufficient support personnel, and sharing of such personnel may well become the norm. Coupled with Section 20 of Regulation 704, boards may lose programs they now have unless qualified staff can be found.

Section 10 of Bill 82 would allow the Minister to make regulations for a phase-in period and for identification, placement and review committees of boards. Such committees would obviously create enormous time workloads for members. Section 20 would remove the conditions for exclusion from attendance at school of blind, deaf, or mentally handicapped children even if they are eligible to attend a provincial school. Boards lacking sufficient numbers of such children to warrant establishing such programs may well have to cooperate with other boards, and geographic distances and ensuing costs may create difficult problems.

There are staffing implications in Sections 69, 70, and 71 of Bill 82 which require Separate School Boards to provide programs for trainable retarded pupils. Public boards which now offer such programs may need to engage in program reorganization and staff reductions as pupils from Separate boards return to their jurisdictions. There are also sections of Bill 82 that seem to expect bilingual programming and support services, which have further staffing implications.

Teacher-Board Collective Agreements

The decade of the 1970's was marked by an increase in teacher efforts to negotiate matters such as pupil-teacher ratio, instructional load, and class size. As Table 5 shows, while only around one-third of the 76 secondary agreements on file with the Education Relations Commission for 1975-76 had provisions related to pupil-teacher ratios and instructional loads, the proportion has risen to roughly 60% in the 1979-80 agreements that were on file with the Commission at the time that our data were collected for this study. Boards have been slower to yield to negotiated class sizes, although the percentage of agreements with class size provisions rose from around 20% in 1975-76 to more than one-third from 1978 on. (See Table 5). As the decade came to an end, provisions related to surplus/redundancy were also becoming more common, and some of these provisions had implications for program organzation and delivery.

Pupil-Teacher Ratios

Of 43 secondary collective agreements on file with the Education Relations Commission at the time of our study, 35 included some provision related to pupil-teacher ratios. (See Appendix B for the list of boards having such provisions in their agreements). The most common pattern among the 35 agreements was to state a pupil-teacher ratio to apply for the entire system. Only 7 agreements specified a pupil-teacher ratio for individual secondary schools. One agreement, for example, noted that the board's PTR of 17.27:1 would result in differentiated pupil-teacher ratios for the seven high schools in the system (Renfrew County). The average PTR across the 35 agreements was approximately 17.1:1, although it was difficult to determine an exact average since some agreements did not make it clear which staff positions were included in the calculation of the ratio.

Three agreements (Ottawa, Peterborough County, and Sudbury) use a formula for determining the PTR for each school in the system. The Ottawa agreement for example, includes the following:

Table 5

Provision of Clauses Related to Class Size, Pupil-Teacher Ratio, and Instructional Load in Collective Agreements with Secondary School Teachers, 1975-1980

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario.)

CLAUSES	1975-76		1976-77		1977-78		1978-79		1979-80*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Class Size										
Provision	15	19.7	17	22.4	23	30.7	24	33.8	9	36.0
Mandatory	6		7		7		8		1	
Guideline	9		10		16		16		8	
No Provision	61	80.3	59	77.6	52	69.3	47	66.2	16	64.0
Total Agreements Filed	76		76		75		71		25	
Pupil-Teacher Ratio										
Provision	24	31.6	32	42.1	38	50.7	39	54.9	15	60.0
Mandatory	23		32		36		37		13	
Guideline	1		0		2		2		2	
No Provision	52	68.4	44	57.9	37	49.3	32	45.1	10	40.0
Total Agreements Filed	76		76		75		71		25	
Instructional Load										
Provision	27	35.5	32	42.1	34	48.0	36	50.7	15	60.0
No Provision	49	64.5	44	57.9	41	52.0	35	49.3	10	40.0
Total Agreements Filed	76		76		75		71		25	

*At the time these data were collected, only 25 agreements were on file with the ERC.

> ...the formulation determines the number of teachers which shall be allocated to a school when average class size is determined by multiplying each Loading Factor by a constant which...is stipulated as 13. (+ or -) 25.

Classroom Teacher Formula:	Loading Factor
Academic Advanced and Enriched	2.1
Academic General	2.0
French-Anglais (second language)	1.7
Technical and Home Economics	1.3
Special Vocational Academic	1.2
Special Vocational Shops	1.0
Vocational Academic	1.5
Vocational Shops	1.2

Most of the agreements examined specified that the pupil-teacher ratio would be based on, or adjusted to, actual enrolments. Fourteen of the 35 also included a specific "tolerance" level (of some percentage of the agreed-upon ratio, for example). Three agreements stated a particular PTR but provided for some flexibility. Espanola's agreement,for example, stated that the board would staff the Espanola High School on a staffing ratio of 17 to 1, but if a small variation existed due to a change in enrolment, "it is understood that there will be some give and take by both parties." Frontenac County's agreement designated a staffing objective for all schools except Sharbot Lake High School to be the staffing project divided by 17.5, but added that the objective would be "subject to revision up or down in individual schools in light of the exigencies of class loading." The North Shore Board, according to the agreement, would try to staff its secondary schools to realize an overall PTR of 16.1:1 (excluding any additional teachers hired as a result of French as a First Language grant), providing such a ratio could be maintained "within a budget consistent with responsible fiscal management."

Ten other agreements included stipulations for making adjustments when the PTR varies from the stated objective. Six of them stated that the board could enlarge or reduce its teaching staff, as the situation demanded. Four of them allowed only for the hiring of more teachers if the PTR exceeded the limits set. Nineteen agreements included no mention of what was to be done should the PTR vary from the stated objective.

Windsor's agreement was one of the few that mentioned the possibility of teacher redundancy:

> The Board shall fix the Pupil Teacher Ratio within the range of 16.5 to 1 and 16.8 to 1. Should the PTR struck by the Board be above 16.5:1 and result in teachers being declared redundant, the Board agrees to let the PTR be adjusted downwards to protect teachers who may otherwise be declared redundant but in no case shall the PTR be adjusted below 16.5:1....In the event that the actual enrolment is less than that so recommended, the Board may reduce the number of teacher(s) in its employment as of the 31st of December.

In two cases, the size of the schools was taken into account when stipulating the PTR. One Sudbury agreement has separate ratios for regular, occupational, service, and hard-of-hearing students. Their PTR for regular students is 20.35, but in schools of 600 or under, the figure drops to 19.82. Prescott and Russell set the PTR as low as 16 because of the "bilingual nature of our schools and because of the small schools under the jurisdiction of the Board."

One of the few agreements that set differentiated pupil-teacher ratios according to the type of student is Metropolitan Toronto, which specified the following in its agreement:

Advanced Level	20.9
General Level	20.0
Shop	15.0
Occupational	14.4
Special Vocational	13.6
Grade 9 (Junior High)	19.0

Table 6 summarizes the content of clauses in the 35 collective agreements examined by the research team.

Table 6

Summary of Content of Collective Agreement Clauses Related to Pupil-Teacher Ratios 1979 - 80

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario)

Content of Clauses	N	%
System-wide PTR	27	77
School PTR	7*	20
Combination	1	3
Total	35	100
Based on projected enrolment	7	20
Based on, or adjusted to, actual enrolment	23	66
Unspecified	5	14
Total	35	100
Mandatory	18	51
Guideline	5	14
Uncertain	12	35
Total	35	100
One ratio used	27	77
More than one ratio used	8	23
Total	35	100
Tolerance specified	14	40
No tolerance specified	21	60
Total	35	100

*Three of these are from Boards with only one school.

Instructional Load

The negotiated (or assigned) pupil-teacher ratio for a secondary school obviously dictates the total number of teachers available for course assignment by the principal. As we have seen, there are some cases in which there are different PTR's for different kinds of programs or even various difficulty levels or types of students taught. An even greater potential constraint to the managerial role of the principal is that of negotiated instructional load. Principals must plan the schedule of courses and teaching assignments in keeping with the workload conditions stated in the collective agreement.

Thirty-four of the 43 collective agreements on file at the time our data were collected included clauses related to instructional load (or teacher workload). The names of the boards concerned appear in Appendix B. Table 7 summarizes the content of clauses related to instructional load in the collective agreements that we examined.

As Table 7 reveals, 18 agreements established a mandatory limit on instructional workload, while 13 agreements provided guidelines for the setting of workloads. Over half of the agreements included workload stipulations that applied only to teaching, while others placed restrictions both on teaching and preparation time. The limitations on teaching assignments were most often stated in terms of a specific number of class periods for which teachers could be assigned instructional responsibilities. A few agreements provided limits on the basis of numbers of instructional responsibilities or of the percentage of time that could be subject to teaching assignment. With reference to preparation allowances, a few agreements limited the number of different course preparations for which a teacher could be assigned. These data are summarized in Table 8.

Table 7

Summary of Content of Collective Agreement Clauses

Related to Instruction Load 1979 - 80

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario)

Content of Clauses	N	%
Mandatory limit	18	53
Guidelines	13	38
Combination	3	9
	34	100
Applies to teaching only	21	62
Applies to preparation only	1	3
Applies to both	12	35
	34	100
Teaching		
Number of periods specified	21	NA
Number of minutes specified	4	NA
Percentage of time specified	8	NA
Number of consecutive periods specified	3	NA
Preparation		
Number of minutes or periods specified	5	NA
Number of preparations specified	6	NA
Percentage of time specified	3	NA
Reduced load for those with administrative duties	15	44
Maximum pupil-teacher contacts	11	32

Table 8

Negotiated Limitations on Teaching Assignments and Allowance for Preparation Time 1979 - 80

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario)

Limitations on Teaching

Number of periods:	6	6/8	36/6 days	30/40	6/9	7	7/9
(Number of Boards)	6	6	1	2	2	1	1

Number of minutes:	288/day	240/day	1200/week
(Number of Boards)	1	1	2

Percentage of Time:	75	77	80
(Number of Boards)	6	1	1

Number of Consecutive periods:	4	4-40min.	3-36min. or 2-72min. or 2-36min. + 1-72min.
(Number of Boards)	1	1	1

Allowance for Preparation

Number of periods:	1	1.5/8	7/40	2-36min. or 1-72min.	2-40min.
(Number of Boards	1	1	1	1	1

Number of Preparations:	3	4
(Number of Boards)	4	2

Percentage of Time:	20	16
(Number of Boards)	2	1

Eleven boards included maximum pupil-teacher contacts in their collective agreements with secondary teachers. The calculation of contacts bears not only upon the number of instructional assignments but also upon the class sizes across a teacher's total instructional workload. Table 9 illustrates how boards are moving to establish maximum contacts on the basis of type of school program.

The constraints that negotiated instructional loads place on a principal's flexibility in organizing the school's course schedule and timetable can be inferred by examining the actual wording of such clauses. Examples are presented below from two very different kinds of educational settings, the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the Nipissing Board of Education.

> Metropolitan Toronto: No Teacher will be required to teach more than the equivalent of four consecutive periods of 40 minutes each. After teaching four such periods, a Teacher shall be entitled to an unassigned period of at least 40 minutes, which may include a lunch period or a preparation period.
>
> A full-time classroom Teacher shall have, per day, two full 40 minute periods, or the equivalent thereof, free from teaching and non-teaching duties, inclusive of a lunch period, and one full 40 minute period free of scheduled teaching duties, but subject to assigned supervision or "on call" duties.
>
> A Probationary Teacher with less than two years of Teaching Experience shall not be required to prepare for more than three different courses each day, and a Probationary Teacher with two or more years of Teaching Experience shall not be required to prepare for more than four different courses each day. In semestered schools, unless otherwise agreed by the principal and a Probationary Teacher, a Probationary Teacher shall not be required to prepare for more than two different courses each day.
>
> Nipissing: The Principal of each secondary school shall exercise his or her best efforts to timetable the teaching staff of that secondary school by observing the following guidelines as maximums:
> (1) for schools with enrolments over 500 students:
> (a) 6/8 teaching periods per day (as an average)
> (b) 180 student-teacher contacts per day (on the average)
> (c) 4 different lesson preparations per day (on the average)

(2) for schools with enrolments under 500 students:
   (a) 7/9 teaching periods per one cycle (cycle = 1½ days)
   (b) 160 student-teacher contacts per cycle (on the average)
   (c) 5 different lesson preparations per cycle (on the average)

Table 9

Stipulated Pupil-Teacher Contacts in Ten Agreements 1979 - 80

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario)

Hamilton

English, Francais	150
Science	165
Music, Art	138
Tech. Ed., Family Studies	120
Other	180

Huron County

Advanced	180
General	155
Tech., Remedial	140
Spec. Ed.	100

Kent County

180

Lincoln County

Phase 3	180
Unphased, Phase 2	150
Tech. Shops, Phase 1 Academic, Limited Facility	120
Phase 1 Shops	90

London

Academic, Commercial	190
Technical	130
Occupations-Technical	118
Occupations-Academic	142

Niagara South

Academic	180
Technical	120
Vocational-Academic	120
Vocational-Practical	96

Nipissing

Schools over 500	180
Schools under 500	160

Simcoe County

180

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Co.

Academic, Commercial	180
Technical Shops	120
Occupations-Academic	120
Occupations-Practical	96
Special Ed.	72

Wentworth County

Advanced	180
General Academic	170
Vocational Academic	170
Tech., Home Economics	144
Special Ed.	108

Seven collective agreements that we examined stated specific conditions under which the instructional load guidelines could be exceeded. In three boards (Lanark County, Lennox and Addington County, and North Shore), exceptions could be made with the mutual consent of the principal and the teacher concerned. Renfrew County's agreement included department heads in consultation with the principal and teacher and added a statement that the teacher could choose less unassigned time in return for smaller classes. An exemption from supervisory duties was specified in the Nipigon-Red Rock agreement as compensation for a workload exceeding the guideline. West Parry Sound's agreement stated that the teacher must consent in writing since the teacher was under no obligation to accept a heavier load. If the teacher agreed to do so, the teacher would be excused from supervisory duties.

School size and program needs were named in three agreements as factors in decisions to exceed guidelines. For example, Lambton County's agreement noted that variations would arise because of limitations in school size, number of courses offered, and the experience of the teacher. North Shore's agreement added the number of basic level courses as a factor to be considered in making exceptions.

Class Size

Further constraints were placed upon the principal's flexibility in coordinating student choice of courses and timetabling by the presence in 23 of the 43 collective agreements of negotiated class sizes. A list of boards having such clauses is provided in Appendix B. In each of the 23 agreements, the class size clauses refer to individual schools rather than to the entire school board. The maximum class sizes that were specified most frequently were the following:

Academic (Advanced)	30
General	25
Technical	20
Spec. Ed./Voc./Occ.-Academic	20
Spec. Ed./Voc./Occ.-Practical	15
Remedial (Basic)	15

Table 10 presents a summary of the content of class size clauses in the collective agreements that we examined. Only 8 of the 23 boards had mandatory maximum class sizes. Of 11 boards which specified that exemptions could be made to class size limits, eight did not require the teacher's agreement. In four cases, varying degrees of protection were offered to teachers when the guidelines were exceeded. Lake Superior and Norfolk County both require mutual consent of the Board and the teacher in order to form classes larger than those specified in the agreement. Michipicoten requires that the Board first consult with the principal, department head and teacher before taking such action, although teacher consent does not appear to be mandatory. In the Huron County agreement, teacher consent _is_ needed to exceed the guidelines, but Federation intervention is somewhat curtailed:

> In recognition of special cases that may arise, a teacher who desires to do so may exceed the guidelines set forth in this Article upon the approval of his principal and superintendent and the Branch Affiliate President. Such approval shall not be arbitrarily withheld.

Seven agreements mention that exceptions may occur but do not stipulate either consent or consultation on the part of the teacher. A typical instance is that of North Shore's agreement which states that it is understood that the class sizes are provided only as a guide and local circumstances or unusual conditions may dictate adjustments to these limits. The agreement in Lambton County states that, if student selection of courses makes it necessary for class sizes to go outside the ranges, the teachers are expected to cooperate with the principal's decision.

Table 10

Summary of Clauses in Collective Agreements Related to Class Size 1979 - 80

(Source: Education Relations Commission of Ontario)

Content of Clauses	Size Specification					
Type of Agreement:	Total	Maximum	Average	Range	Combination	Other
Mandatory	8	3	3	0	2	0
"Best Efforts"	11	9	0	1	1	0
Unspecified	4	0	2	0	1	1
	23	12	5	1	4	1
Conditions under which exceptions can be made:						
Agreement of teacher required	3	2	1	0	0	
Agreement not required	8	7	0	1	0	
	11	9	1	1	0	

Teacher Surplus/Redundancy

While 37 of the 43 collective agreements that we examined included clauses or policies related to teacher surplus or redundancy, only 11 of them had clauses that mentioned or implied the need to protect school programs as a factor to be considered in redundancy decisions. The major criterion for the majority of boards was seniority, meaning that school principals may face the problem of staffing courses with teachers who are not fully qualified to teach in that subject area. The list of the 11 boards which did include some program stipulation in redundancy decisions is included in Appendix B.

Among the 11 agreements that did include program factors in redundancy decisions, a few merely imply that one issue is protection of program. Peel County's agreement, for example, states that the hiring of new staff shall not take place until all teachers on the Administrative Transfer List have been placed, except in the case(s) of those positions for which no teacher on the Administrative Transfer List is certified. The remaining clauses mention program more explicitly. The agreement for Lincoln County, for example, specifies that when the exact number of teachers to which a school is entitled has been determined, and bearing in mind that the program needs of the school shall be the first priority, a list of teachers who are surplus to the school will be developed, if necessary. The agreements for Elgin County and Central Algoma include clauses that note that teachers whose loss would mean the elimination of a program will, at the direction of the board, be excluded from consideration under this policy. Principals in boards which do not have such program considerations in surplus and redundancy clauses might indeed face the elimination of a program.

Summary

In this chapter, we first documented five major changes made from 1972-1979 in requirements for the granting of the Secondary School Graduation Diploma. The impetus of the various changes has been to move from no compulsory subjects to nine compulsory credits. Secondary school principals must keep account, for each student, of the entry date into a secondary program since the graduation requirements applicable to that student vary by date of entry.

Despite these changes, the basic philosophy of the Ministry has remained consistent. Insofar as possible, secondary school organization should allow each student to pursue a program suited to his or her individual needs and aspirations. As provincially defined compulsory credits were specified, therefore, schools were expected to offer these subjects at varying levels of difficulty, appropriate to individual students.

We have examined curriculum guidelines and documented the shift from an emphasis on local curriculum development in the early 1970's to greater centralization, "a firmer hand in curriculum development," by the Ministry of Education starting with 1976. Although provincially produced curricular materials were henceforth to be "more prescriptive and descriptive" to ensure uniformity, schools still bore the responsibility for adapting these materials to various difficulty levels to meet individual student needs. We have also examined the restrictions placed on schools with regard to course and textbook approval.

A few special programs were examined as they are defined and their development regulated by the Ministry. These included co-operative education programs, occupations programs, and special education programs. With regard to the latter, schools are told to design courses at appropriate levels for exceptional students and to offer such programs over a four-years' duration. It is also noted that class sizes are stipulated in Regulation 704/78.

The second section of this chapter presented a brief summary of some of the restrictions in Regulation 704. Among these were provisions for "heads" in certain program areas, stipulations regarding qualifications of teachers for special program areas, limitations on teaching outside an area of qualification, and stipulations for maximum class sizes in special education courses. As well, this section provided an overview of the proposed Bill 82, which would require the provision of special education services by all provincial school boards.

In the third section of this chapter, we reviewed the most recent collective agreements between boards and secondary teachers that were on file with the Education Relations Commission during the fall and early winter of 1979-80. We found there had been a marked increase between 1975 and 1979-80 in the inclusion of clauses related to PTR, workload, class size, and teacher surplus and redundancy. Some agreements still had only guidelines and suggested limits; others had some procedure for exceptions which could be made to mandated maxima. The trend, nevertheless, was to mandatory limits on teacher workload and class size. With regard to teacher surplus and redundancy, virtually three-fourths of the agreements made no mention of program considerations. Teacher seniority was the major criterion, a pattern which had not changed over the five-year period.

Discussion

The decade of the 1970's was marked by societal changes, which were reflected in the policies governing secondary schools. The overarching concern for the individuality of students, tempered by concerns about society's needs for informed and skilled citizens sharing a common educational foundation, has been the keystone of educational philosophy and policy during the 1970's This foundation was compatible with the traditional desire to provide equality of educational opportunity for all young people.

Ontario's goals were never fully realized during the 1970's in all of our secondary schools. Few would equate secondary school opportunities available to young people in Ontario's remote areas, for example, with those available in more heavily populated areas of the province (see Ryan, 1976). Indeed, one might argue that the move to diversify the curriculum to meet student interests and abilities created more disparities between small Northern high schools and large urban high schools. This is debatable,[1] and certainly there are small high schools with highly committed teachers who have found innovative ways to respond to the provincially-defined objectives. Nonetheless, as we examine the problems that our secondary schools will confront as declining enrolments lessen the obvious chances of meeting educational goals, we must bear in mind that smallness is not a new factor for all of our schools. We should expect differences in the actual and anticipated impact of declining enrolments.

This chapter has also examined the trends emerging in teacher-board collective agreements as these impinge on school scheduling and timetabling. The decade of the 1970's has brought forth increased efforts of teacher federations to improve working conditions and to provide greater job security for their members. The concern with student individuality not only impacted on school curriculum but also affected teacher training as teachers moved to specialize and to improve their qualifications. One of the major problems Ontario will face in the 1980's will be the identification of ways to retain, and benefit from, the huge investment that we have made in preparing instructional personnel, and still accommodate to a contracting student population. In this regard, new Government regulations about teacher qualifications may come into conflict with collective agreements that base surplus and redundancy on seniority alone.

---

[1] A doctoral student at O.I.S.E., Anne Lloyd, is currently conducting a study of program and course offerings in the province's secondary schools, examining the relationship to size of board, size of school, region, and the like.

References

The Individualized System. H.S.1 Studies. (W. G. Fleming, Findings from Five Studies, 1974; Doris W. Ryan (listed below); K. A. Leithwood et al. (listed below); W. E. Alexander and J. P. Farrell, Student Participation in Decision-Making, 1975; G. Laxer, R. E. Traub, and K. Wayne, Student Social and Achievement Patterns, 1974.) Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974-75.

Leithwood, Kenneth, A.; Clipsham, John S.; and Davies, Cheryl. The Individualized System: Courses and Patterns of Student Choice. H.S.1 Studies. Toronto: OISE, 1974.

Ontario Ministry of Education. Circular 14: Textbooks, 1980. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. Secondary School Diploma Requirements: Circular H.S.1, 1979-81 (and earlier issues). Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

and Leadership. H.S.1 Studies. Toronto: OISE, 1974.

Ryan, Doris W. The Individualized System: Administration and Leadership. H.S.1 Studies. Toronto: OISE, 1974.

Ryan, Doris W. "The Basic Skills Controversy: Implications for Secondary School Process," *Canadian Society for the Study of Education Bulletin*, March 1975.

Ryan, Doris W. *The Education of Adolescents in Remote Areas of Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1976.

Ryan, Doris W. "Policy Making in Secondary School Curriculum: The Rise and Demise of the Individualized System," paper presented to the Institute for Educational Leadership, Toronto, 1977, mimeo.

Ryan, Doris W. *Flexible Scheduling: Evaluation of the Scheduling Organization at Hillcrest High School*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, in press.

3 Secondary Schools on the Eve of Decline

Declining enrolments will impact differently upon particular secondary schools in the province. One of the reasons for the variance in impact will be that differences already exist among secondary schools --for example, in size, and in the breadth and depth of their program offerings. The schools also differ in their proximity to other secondary schools and, thus, in the necessity of offering a comprehensive program. It is important, then, to place a study of the impact of declining enrolments on secondary schools in the perspective of current differences.

As an example, let us consider the situation of secondary schools in Northern Ontario and in Central Ontario. There are 28 boards with secondary schools in the Central Ontario region, and there are 29 such boards in the three Northern regions (Midnorthern, Northeastern and Northwestern). However, the single region in Central Ontario contains 287 secondary schools, more than one-half of all secondary schools in Ontario, which is an average of more than 8 secondary schools within each board in the region. In contrast, the three Northern regions contain only 84 secondary schools, for an average of fewer than 3 schools per board. Thus, while each of the two areas has about one-third of the secondary school boards, the Central Region has 53% of the province's high schools compared to 16% in the three Northern regions. (See Table 11).

Although there are 30 small secondary schools in Central Ontario, many of these are specialized schools (vocational or commercial schools, for example) and few, if any, are geographically isolated. As a result, many of these small schools do not have to provide a comprehensive program. In contrast, exactly half of the secondary schools in the

Northwestern region alone are small, and there is no large secondary school in the entire region. Many of the 27 small schools in the three Northern regions are geographically isolated and must attempt to offer programs to meet the varied needs of students.

Table 11

Ontario Secondary Schools by Size and Region

Region	Size Small	Medium	Large
Central	30	201	56
Eastern	11	66	1
Midnorthern	9	23	1
Northeastern	6	20	1
Northwestern	12	12	0
Western	19	67	7
Totals	87	389	66

We suspect that there are regional, school board, and school differences in the secondary programs now available to Ontario young people. It was not a purpose of this study to confirm or to dispute this hypothesis. However, one of Dr. Ryan's doctoral students at O.I.S.E., Anne Lloyd, is currently examining disparaties in secondary program and course offerings and the relationships between program availability and region, size of board, and size of school. Her study should provide a contextual foundation upon which to understand and to anticipate the impact of declining enrolments on particular schools. The regional and board analyses should assist in predicting the feasibility of various alternatives for different secondary school situations

Ontario's elementary schools are currently in the midst of their decline, with projected enrolments stabilizing by 1986. The secondary schools, on the other hand, generally experienced enrolment peaks around 1977. At the time that this study was conducted, secondary school enrolments had just begun to reflect the contracting of the school population. Enrolment projections for secondary schools show the decrease continuing to 1992.

The discussions in this chapter are based upon information provided by 312 secondary school principals in response to a mailed questionnaire and upon group interviews with a total of 30 principals from a variety of school situations. For purposes of analyzing questionnaire responses, schools were classified as small (fewer than 600 students), medium small (from 600 to 999 students), medium large (from 1,000 to 1,500 students), and large (more than 1,500 students).

The current situations of these schools are described in this chapter. The first section includes a discussion of the language of instruction, the grades and the levels of instruction offered. The extent of decline that the schools have encountered so far is examined next and projected enrolments over the next five years are described for the schools whose principals were interviewed. The organizational and program changes that the schools in the questionnaire sample have made during the last five years are examined in the third section. Declining enrolments in particular courses or subject areas are analyzed. Finally, descriptions are given of cooperative activities involving other organizations, groups, or schools.

School Characteristics

Language of Instruction

Among the 312 secondary schools in the survey sample, 281 (or 90%) offered instruction in English. Only seven schools (2%) were French-language schools, and 24 schools (8%) provided bilingual instruction. Among the French-language schools, one was small, five had enrolments of from 600 to 900 students, and only one had more than 900 students. There were no large French-language schools in the sample. Seven of the 24 bilingual schools were small, while the majority (15 schools) had from 600 to 1,500 students, and two were large. The relative smallness of the bilingual secondary schools likely reflects a situation in which neither the English-speaking nor the French-speaking students in the community provide a large enough group to warrant a separate secondary school. One can readily understand the challenge faced by these schools of providing a variety of courses and of difficulty levels in two languages.

Grade Levels

The vast majority (83%) of the 312 schools in the sample offered Grades 9-13, as Table 12 shows. However, among the 63 small secondary schools, some 37% did not offer Grade 13. In contrast, all of the large schools (including a school offering Grades 10-13 and classified as "other") offered Grade 13. Thus, the feasibility of offering Grade 13 to students seems to be related to school size.[1] Indeed, the percent of schools organized to provide all the secondary grades, 9-13, rises as the size of schools increases. For many small schools, there are not enough students who wish to enrol in Grade 13 to justify the program. This situation often means that students must travel some distance to enrol in Grade 13 courses and complete the SSHGD. For example, a principal of a very small Northern high school (fewer than 250 students) reported that students from his community are forced to travel 60 miles each way to another school if they want to complete Grade 13. As declining enrolments increase the number of schools in the under 600 category, it may be difficult for schools so affected by decline to maintain a Grade 13 program.

---

[1] It should be noted that the city of Hamilton has had two schools offering only Grade 13 programs for all of the city's students. Thus, the Grade 9-12 organization in Hamilton's secondary schools would not reflect school size, but rather board policy. The board's policy is currently under review.

Table 12

Secondary School Programs:

Grade Levels Offered by Size of School

Grade Levels	Size of School Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
9 - 13	37 (59%)	78 (85%)	108 (91%)	37 (97%)	260 (83%)
9 - 12	23 (37%)	13 (14%)	10 (8%)	0 -	46 (15%)
Other*	3 (4%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	6 (2%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

*In the "other" category, one school was a junior high school, one offered only Grade 13, two offered Grades 10-13, and two were alternative high schools.[1]

Levels of Instruction

During the years after the introduction of the credit system, Ontario secondary schools began to introduce a variety of difficulty levels for the study of particular subjects. The number and kinds of levels available depended upon the size of the school population and the needs and abilities of students in the school communities. Some of the larger schools began to offer as many as six different levels of instruction. In Circular H.S.1: 1979-81, the Ontario Ministry of Education noted the need for uniform nomenclature for these levels across the province and recommended that secondary school principals change existing labels to four; namely, modified, basic, general, and advanced. Credit courses which may count towards the earning of the

---

[1] An in-depth study of program organization and delivery in Ontario's public alternative high schools is being conducted by an OISE student, David Ducharme, for his Ed. D. thesis. His study focuses on innovative program resources used in these typically small schools.

SSGD could be offered at any of the four levels of difficulty. It was pointed out that open-level and multi-level courses could still be offered where desirable or necessary.

The general characteristics of the four recommended names for difficulty levels, as described in H.S.1: 1979-81, are as follows:

> Modified Level---courses designed to suit the needs of students who desire a skills-oriented course; courses dealing primarily with elemental aspects of a subject and involving students in many practical activities; courses focused on vocational skills important to students after they leave school; and courses particularly modified to suit exceptional students with severe learning problems.
>
> Basic Level---courses designed to provide opportunities for students to gain useful basic knowledge and skills; courses featuring preparation for home life, financial management, appropriate communication, understanding of the media, meaningful interaction with the environment, general knowledge of our society, personal health and fitness, and other basic features useful to students who may or may not anticipate further post-secondary education; and courses that provide a good occupational preparation for direct entry from secondary school into employment.
>
> General Level---courses designed to provide general perspectives on a subject with the emphasis upon more rigorous aspects of the subject than those developed as basic-level courses; courses considered as appropriate preparation for employment or further education in colleges and other non-university educational institutions.
>
> Advanced Level---courses designed to provide theoretical approaches in addition to fundamental knowledge and practical applications; courses providing appropriate preparation for Honour Graduation courses; advanced-level courses that are enriched for gifted students; and courses considered as appropriate preparation for further education in post-secondary institutions.

The secondary school principals in our sample were asked to identify which of the four difficulty levels (according to the recommended nomenclature) their schools offered. Considering each of the four levels separately, Table 13 shows that 93% of the schools currently offer general level courses, and 89% offer advanced level courses. However, while slightly more than two-thirds of the schools now provide basic-level courses, fewer than one-third (27%) provide modified levels of instruction.

The offering of modified courses appears to be related to size of school. That is, the percentage of schools that offer modified-level courses decreases as the size category increases. For example, 32% of the small schools provide modified-level instruction, but only 18% of the large schools do so. It may well be that large schools are located in centres with relatively dense populations, and that the community also contains a smaller secondary school with primary focus upon vocational or modified programs. The small-schools category includes such specialized urban schools as well as small isolated schools that must attempt to provide a comprehensive program.

Table 13

Secondary School Programs:

Levels of Instruction by Size of School

	Size of School				
Instruction	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Total
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Modified	20 (32%)	32 (35%)	27 (23%)	7 (18%)	86 (27%)
Basic	33 (52%)	76 (83%)	83 (70%)	24 (63%)	216 (69%)
General	52 (83%)	85 (92%)	115 (97%)	37 (97%)	289 (93%)
Advanced	45 (71%)	83 (89%)	115 (97%)	37 ((&%)	279 (89%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

The offering of basic-level courses is also somewhat related to size of school. For this category, relatively fewer small schools are able to provide such instruction than are the larger schools. A sizeable majority of the medium-sized schools, both medium small and medium large, offer basic-level courses. Further, although a majority of small schools offer general and advanced level courses, the percentage doing so is smaller than that for the medium-sized or large schools. This is especially true for advanced level courses.

When the particular levels offered in each school were examined, six combinations appeared. In Table 14, these combinations are shown. Type "AG", for example, indicates a school which currently offers courses only at advanced and general levels. There are some apparent relationships between size of school and the pattern of combination of levels in the program. For example, about one-third of both the small and the large secondary schools offer courses only at the advanced and general levels. This would be understandable if these small schools were located in urban areas where other secondary schools provide basic and modified programs. For example, the existence of two special vocational schools in Thunder Bay results in the removal of basic and modified programs from ten secondary schools of medium small size. The truly composite schools, offering all four levels (AGBM), tend to be found more often among medium-sized and large schools than among the small schools. Where large schools offer modified-level courses, they do so in combination with each of the other three levels, a pattern that differs for small and medium-sized schools. Proportionately more small schools offer combinations (GBM or BM) that exclude the advanced level of instruction.

Table 14

Secondary School Programs:

Combinations of Levels of Instruction by Size of School

Combination of Levels*	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
AG	24 (38%)	13 (14%)	33 (28%)	12 (32%)	82 (26%)
AGB	14 (22%)	46 (50%)	55 (46%)	17 (42%)	132 (42%)
AGBM	4 (6%)	22 (24%)	26 (21%)	7 (19%)	59 (19%)
GBM	7 (11%)	4 (4%)	0 -	0 -	11 (4%)
BM	7 (11%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)	0 -	12 (4%)
Other**	7 (11%)	3 (3%)	4 (3%)	2 (5%)	16 (5%)

Size of School

*The letters stand for the following: A = Advanced; G = General; B = Basic; M = Modified.
**Specialized schools were classified as "other".
Note: Percentages are rounded.

One must be cautious in generalizing from these data since comments written in by many principals on the questionnaire called attention to the fact that courses were often "stacked"; that is, courses may be multi-level. Thus, the indication that a school offers three different difficulty levels, for example, may not mean that the school offers separate courses at the three levels. A principal of one small school reported that two levels of instruction were taught in two different rooms of his school, during the same time slot, by the same teacher. Several principals noted that only required subjects were offered at the basic level of difficulty. A different kind of qualifier is that several principals wrote in a fifth level, enriched or honours, indicating that they offer two distinct types of advanced level courses.

All of these examples serve to indicate the need to interpret these data cautiously. Because the necessity of combining difficulty levels within a single course is viewed by principals as increasing with declining enrolments, and because the principals view this trend generally as detrimental to a student's instructional experiences, a full discussion of what is happening, or may happen in the future, with reference to levels of instruction is offered both in a later section of this chapter and in the next chapter.

Extent of Decline

The questionnaire asked principals about their September enrolments in each school year from 1975-76 through 1979-80. From the information supplied, schools were classified as: (1) being in decline, where enrolments had been dropping steadily across most of the time period; (2) starting to decline, where drops had occurred only in the last two years; (3) having steady enrolments over the five school years; (4) still growing in enrolment across the time period; and (5) having erratic enrolment patterns, with increases in some years and decreases in others.

As Table 15 shows, around one-half of the secondary schools in our sample were either in decline or were starting to decline. Around one-fourth of the schools were continuing to increase in enrolment, and another 24% reported a steady pattern of enrolment during the five years surveyed. Size of school did not appear to be related to the extent of decline over the time period. However, relatively more small schools than larger schools had been in decline over the entire five years. Few large schools reported a steady enrolment pattern; around one-half were declining and another 29% increasing in enrolments during the five school years under study.

Table 15

Secondary School Enrolment Patterns over Five School Years

(1975-76 through 1979-80)

	Size of School				
Pattern	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Decline	26 (41%)[1]	36 (39%)	35 (29%)	13 (34%)	110 (35%)
Start of Decline	4 (6%)	12 (13%)	19 (16%)	7 (19%)	42 (14%)
Steady	19 (30%)	22 (24%)	30 (25%)	5 (13%)	76 (24%)
Growth	14 (22%)	20 (22%)	30 (25%)	11 (29%)	75 (24%)
Erratic	0 -	2 (2%)	5 (4%)	2 (5%)	9 (3%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Interpretation: 41% of the 63 small schools are in a state of decline.

It must be remembered that the main impact of declining enrolments will not be felt by most of the province's secondary schools until around 1983 or 1984, and that enrolments are projected to continue to decrease until around 1992. The thirty principals whom we interviewed were asked about their projected enrolments over the following five years. The information they provided presents a sobering picture of the impact to be felt in Ontario's secondary education sector.

Principals of non-remote area secondary schools that have always been small (fewer than 600 students) tend to have greater fears about potential school closure than do their counterparts in larger schools or in small isolated schools. Nevertheless, principals of all very small schools seem to be less affected, in a traumatic sense, by further decline in enrolments than do principals in medium-large secondary schools. This is not to suggest that the small schools have fewer problems in offering adequate program to students; rather, it does suggest that the problems they will face because of declining enrolments will not produce such sharp changes in already existing programs. Declining enrolments likely will impact to the greatest degree of intensity on schools that are currently in the medium-sized categories, medium small or medium large.

A principal of a small rural high school in which the enrolment will go from a high of around 390 to a low of around 300 as decline increases stated that his greatest fear was in losing his Grade 13 program. The program had only 19 students that year. If the program is discontinued, he fears that many of the younger students will also leave to attend another secondary school for the sake of continuity. The principal of a junior vocational school in an urban area projected an enrolment drop, starting the next year, which would move the school enrolment from a high of some 450 to below 350. He has lost three teachers already and expects to lose four more by 1982, a reduction of 10% of his staff. He fears that the school "may be closed as students elect to attend a larger school in the city that has begun to offer a modified program in direct competition with [his] school."

From the interviews, it appears that secondary schools currently in the medium-sized category (from 600 to 1,500 students) will experience the sharpest decline. This is especially true of schools in the medium-large category (1,000 to 1,500 students), many of which will become small schools over a period of five years or so. Lest principals in rural or remote areas believe that their urban colleagues are in enviable positions, consider the reports that we received from some of these principals.

Two principals from a single urban board presented a similar case. One of the schools, located in a traditionally stable community, had enrolled around 1,100 students each September for several years. Decline had been very gradual, with the current enrolment standing at 848. However, the school's enrolment was projected to drop to 426 by 1984, a decline of some 60%. This principal had already lost 8 staff positions and expected to lose another 7 that year, with no end to the staff reductions in sight. The other school had also had a stable school enrolment over several years of more than 1,225 students. The enrolment was only down to 1,095 during the 1979-80 school year, but the rate of decline would increase starting the next fall, and was projected to level off by 1984 with a school enrolment of 473, a decrease of 63%! Eleven staff positions were being lost for the next year alone. Finally, the principal of another urban school reported that the school enrolment had peaked at 915 students eight years before and would go to a low of around 500 by 1984 or 1985, a loss of some 400 students.

We heard similar, though perhaps not quite so dramatic, projections from several other principals of schools that have had enrolments of more than 1,000 students over the past several years. From a peak enrolment of 1,200, for example, one rural school will decline to 700 by 1984, according to "conservative" estimates. Another school in a relatively small urban community in Eastern Ontario will drop from 1,000 to a projected 660 students by 1984. The principal reported that the secondary schools in his county would lose 2,000 students over the next five years, "which is the equivalent of two new high schools." From the Niagara district, a principal reported projections of from 1,200 (the peak) to 500 by 1986. He anticipated a loss of 12 teaching positions within the next three years, added to the four positions lost that year. Another principal in the Niagara Region stated that his board had lost 40 of 808 secondary teaching positions already, and now have no secondary school with over 800 students. His own school's enrolment was declining gradually, having gone from 1,000 to around 800 that year.

From the Western Region of Ontario, a principal projected an enrolment drop of from 1,300 to 800 within the next five years. Another school in this region will go from 1,053 to 772 students by 1983. The principal of a rural school reported that his school's enrolment is expected to drop from 1,051 to 667 by 1984.

Large high schools (with current enrolments of more than 1,500 students) will not escape the phenomenon of declining enrolments. For a few, however, it will be at least a small blessing. For example, the principal of a commercial high school in a large urban area stated that the school's enrolment had peaked at 2,500, at which time the school had 27 portables. The school was nicknamed "Portable City" by the students, and two generations of students had attended the school without having access to a playing field. The school had been losing around 100 students each year and was currently down to 1,742 students. The principal stated that the physical change brought about by decline--the removal of the portables--is viewed as a positive development.

The large secondary schools tend to be located in urban areas. This location provides a potential clientele that could offset decline, if open boundaries are present and if the school has something to "sell". (The obvious detrimental aspects of such between-school competition will be discussed later.) For example, one principal believes that his school's enrolment will decrease only gradually (from its peak of over 2,000) because of the board's optional attendance scheme and because his school has a "traditional, academic image" that is in contrast with the parents' image of a nearby open-concept, semestered school. On a more positive note, urban high schools also have the opportunity to attract clients that would not normally be in school. One such large school, located in Eastern Ontario, is projected to drop from a high of 1,600 students to around 900 by 1984, but the staff is engaged in developing and introducing several innovative programs to attract community residents of various ages.

In short, the data on current levels of decline paint a misleading picture of the situation that Ontario secondary schools will be in in five years' time. The current impacts of declining enrolments on the school's program organization will be discussed in the sections that follow. The anticipated impacts of declining enrolments on program and staffing are discussed in Chapter 4.

Organizational and Program Changes over Five School Years (1975-76 through 1979-80)

The terms of reference for this study included a requirement to examine the changes in secondary school organizational patterns that had been brought about by declining enrolments. However, it has already been observed that only about one-third of the schools in our sample have had declining enrolments over much of the five years studied and that another 14% are just entering decline. While the information that we received from principals regarding past organizational changes sometimes reflected decline, changes had also been introduced for pedagogical reasons--that is, to improve educational experiences for students--or for other reasons. The additional changes that principals anticipate making in the future in response to decline are discussed in Chapter 4.

The responses to the question regarding organizational changes were grouped into categories. The most commonly reported changes were the following:

Stacking of classes. This category includes cases in which principals report having to combine grade levels into a single course and cases in which difficulty levels have been combined into multi-level courses. Both types of "stacking" tend to be used as a means of coping with small enrolments, thus protecting the existence of a course or, in some small schools, a total program. When stacking occurs, teachers are supposed to evaluate students according to the expectations for their grade or level rather than in comparison with the total group. (Recall that H.S.1: 1979-81 stated that multi-level courses were permissible, but it was recommended that no more than two grade levels or difficulty levels be combined in any one course).

Change to semestering. This category includes schools that have introduced semestering during the years 1975-80. The usual reason for changing to this type of organization in the past was to provide greater flexibility for students who can "drop-in" or "drop-out" of school twice a year and still earn some credits or for students who wish to graduate at mid-term and have time to work or travel. However, declining enrolments have promoted situations in which some secondary schools are considering a move to semestering as a means of attracting students from other schools.

There are two major types of semestering. Under full-credit semestering, students receive a full credit in courses during each of two school terms; the classes typically are around 70 minutes in length. Courses offered in a half-credit semestered program may meet all year long in classes of some 40 minutes' duration. Students receive a half-credit for each school semester, and some courses may be offered only for half a year.

Change from semestering. This category includes schools that have changed from semestering to another type of organization during the years 1975-80. Because full-credit semestering in particular creates timetabling difficulties for small schools (because of single-section courses leading to timetable conflicts), declining enrolments may be a factor in such changes.

Timetable changes. This category includes timetabling changes other than those described as moves to and from semestering. It includes partial semestering, 70-minute extended periods, varieties of tumbled timetables, and the like.

Changes in difficulty levels. Included in this category are the additions of more courses at a particular difficulty level, in response to student needs, and the designation of courses as "open" or "zero" level, often a response to declining enrolments.

Course additions. Schools still experiencing increases in enrolment sometimes reported the addition of new courses to the school's program, adding to the opportunities available to students. However, this category also includes cases in which new courses have been added by schools to attract new clients or to retain students who might otherwise leave school, in an effort to offset decline.

Reduction of options. The reduction of a school's optional courses is related to declining enrolments, but it may reflect student choice of courses, as we shall see.

Establishment of co-educational classes. This category includes situations in which principals have begun to allow both boys and girls to enrol in courses in areas such as physical education, home economics, and industrial arts. This reflects a change that is not only encouraged by the Ministry to avoid sex-stereotyping or discrimination, but also to counter the impact of declining enrolments, in that some principals have made this change to maintain viable class sizes.

Other changes. A variety of other changes were cited. Many of these had to do with the introduction of co-operative work programs and will be discussed under alternative programs. A few principals mentioned such changes as reductions in positions of responsibility, such as vice-principal and department headship positions. These changes tend to be due to declining enrolments.

Table 16 provides a summary of the degree to which these types of organizational changes have been made in secondary schools during the five years studied. The only type of change reported by as many as one-fourth of the schools was the stacking of classes, i.e. the combination of grades or difficulty levels in single classes. This situation was reported least frequently in large schools and most often by the medium-large schools. As we shall see later, principals expect that stacking or the change to multi-level courses will increase as enrolments continue to decline. More than one-third of the small schools have already begun to offer some courses in alternate years, and more than one-fifth of the medium-sized schools have adopted this strategy for coping with decline.

Although few schools that had adopted a semestered organization in the past have now returned to a more traditional timetabling organization, there was a movement in the other direction. In particular, almost one-fourth of the large high schools and 19% of the small schools had introduced semestering during the five years studied. Further, a variety of other kinds of timetable changes had been introduced by more than one-fourth of the large and medium-large schools. Examples of these kinds of organizational changes include: (1) a shift to a tumbled timetable (in which classes are scheduled at different times of the day on cycles of various lengths or numbers of days); (2) adoption of an organization in which courses in certain subject areas, such as technical, are semestered (with longer periods), while courses in other subject areas remain on a traditional timetable of 40-minute periods; and (3) adoption of 70-minute periods (as in semestering) but scheduling classes every other day so that students still enrol in the courses for the entire school year in order to receive a credit.

Table 16

Organizational and Program Changes Made over Five School Years (1975-76 through 1979-80)

Organizational or Program Change	Size of School Small	 Medium Small	 Medium Large	 Large	Totals
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Stacking of Classes	14 (22%)	22 (24%)	39 (33%)	6 (16%)	81 (26%)
Alternate Year Offerings	22 (35%)	19 (21%)	27 (2[illegible])	2 (5%)	70 (23%)
Change to Semestering	12 (19%)	11 (12%)	11 ([illegible]	9 (24%)	43 (14%)
Change from Semestering	3 (5%)	5 (5%)	8 (7%)	0 -	16 (5%)
Timetable Changes	12 (19%)	15 (16%)	30 (25%)	10 (26%)	67 (22%)
Changes in Difficulty Levels	5 (8%)	11 (12%)	9 (8%)	1 (3%)	26 (8%)
Courses Added	8 (13%)	3 (3%)	11 (9%)	4 (11%)	26 (8%)
Reduction of Options	5 (8%)	8 (9%)	7 (6%)	1 (3%)	21 (7%)
Co-ed Classes Established	3 (5%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	0 -	6 (2%)
Other Changes	13 (21%)	15 (16%)	24 (20%)	4 (11%)	56 (18%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Summarizing the kinds of organizational changes that are reported by secondary schools in the different size categories, small schools have most frequently introduced alternate-year offerings of courses, stacking of courses into multi-level or multi-grade classes, semestering or other timetable changes. The pattern is similar for medium-sized schools, although stacking has occurred more often than offering courses in alternate years. The large schools have most often adopted changes in their timetabling organization, moved to semestering, or, to a lesser extent, introduced multi-level or multi-grade courses. Note, however, that no type of organizational or program change was reported by more than 26% of all the schools as having occurred in the recent past.

Reasons for Program and Organizational Changes

Although principals were asked on the questionnaire to give reasons for the program and organizational changes that had been made over the past five years, only 25% of the principals offered responses. These are summarized in Table 17. In order to construct this table the comments were assigned to four categories; namely, declining enrolments, Ministry regulations, pedagogical reasons, and other reasons. The category "pedagogical reasons" refers to changes introduced because of a belief that the changes would result in improved student achievement.

Small schools and medium small-schools cite declining enrolments as a reason for program change more often than do larger schools. Ten percent of the small schools also identify Ministry regulations as a motivation for program change. The percentage of schools citing pedagogical reasons for change is fairly evenly distributed across all categories of school size, while approximately one-fourth of all schools except the large schools suggested other reasons for change. The content of these reasons is evident in the discussion that follows.

Table 17

Reasons for Program and Organizational Changes

Introduced over Five School Years (1975-76 through 1979-80)

Size of School

Reason for Change	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Total[1]
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Declining Enrolments	11 (18%)	14 (15%)	14 (12%)	1 (3%)	40 (13%)
Ministry Regulations	6 (10%)	3 (3%)	10 (8%)	1 (3%)	20 (6%)
Pedagogical Reasons	8 (13%)	10 (11%)	13 (11%)	5 (13%)	36 (12%)
Other Reasons	16 (25%)	22 (24%)	31 (20%)	3 (8%)	72 (23%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Totals do not always indicate 100% response. Not all principals responded to the question. Others gave multiple reasons for change.

Discussion of Organizational and Program Changes

As noted, principals were asked to respond to an open-ended question on the questionnaire about organizational and program changes. As well, the 30 principals whom we interviewed were asked to describe such changes more fully. A great many of the comments concerned the matter of "stacking" of classes into multi-level or multi-grade courses. Invariably, this was a change forced upon schools by student course enrolments that were insufficient to justify scheduling separate courses or sections. (Note that the small course enrolments sometimes reflected student choice of individual timetables and not just declining enrolments in general).

From principals of small high schools, we were informed about many cases of stacking. For example, one principal had combined Grade 11 Art with Grade 13 Art under one teacher in order to maintain the Grade 13 Art course. Grades 10, 11, and 12 Music similarly had been combined into one class. Another principal stated that such stacking led to classes in which students entered with great disparities in capability and background (age or maturity), and that "this disparity has finally killed Grade 13 French."

The principal of a small junior vocational school (which is limited to offering basic and modified levels, called Levels 1, 2 and 3 in his system) told us in the interview that there were not enough Level 1 or Level 3 students to form separate classes. Their Level 1 students, who number only about 30 of the 400 students, are in what is called a Life Skills group. These are students who function below a Grade 2 level in reading. "Most of them go into a sheltered workshop situation. We can't very successfully train them for a responsible kind of employment, and most of them would never be able to cope alone in an urban society. They'll always have to be looked after by friends, family or an institution of some sort." Most of the students in his school fit the Level 2 designation, which is similar to the Ministry's modified level. These students read at about the 3.7 grade level on the average. The Level 3 students would be closest to the Ministry's designation of basic (or remedial) level.

Despite the wide range of reading and arithmetic skills among the students, the school is forced to offer multi-level and multi-grade classes in optional courses and senior level courses. Teachers are urged to individualize assignments (by giving extra work to students working at Level 3, for example) and to award credits at any one of the three levels at the end of the year on an individual student basis. Classes in English and Math are streamed, but teachers in other subject areas have a difficult teaching task because of the variety of student skills.

A sizeable number of medium-sized schools have also found it necessary to stack classes. One of these principals wrote that he had been faced with the choice either of combining the general and advanced level courses in History, Geography, Latin, and Spanish or of cutting program. He saw this as being due to staff reductions which, in turn, were caused by enrolment decline. Another of these principals reported that "negotiations and economics" had forced him to increase class sizes, so that he had combined levels in courses such as senior technical and shorthand. He expects that the number of combined levels will increase since the latest H.S.1 Circular has sanctioned the practice, but added that "this, of course, is very poor educationally in my view and should be the last resort rather than the common occurrence."

Several principals spoke about losses in the flexibility to provide separate courses at different levels of difficulty. The principal of a formerly medium-large school has been forced to eliminate all Level 6 (Enriched) courses---"We could not stretch staff to meet that kind of option"--and is combining the general and advanced levels in some subject areas. The principal of another medium-sized school stated that timetabling flexibility had suffered severely as a result of the increases in single-section and double-section courses. During that academic year (1979-80), some 46 of the school's 112 courses were single-section courses and 36 were double-section courses, making it very difficult to avoid student timetable conflicts. A third principal stated that, because senior level course enrolments were down, the staff had to combine such subjects as Grade 12 and Grade 13 French. The only other way to have kept the small, separate courses alive would have been to increase class sizes beyond 35 in Grade 9 courses.

Although over one-third of the small schools reported offering some courses in alternate years rather than reducing program, this practice is not universally seen as positive. The principal of one small school, for example, wrote that his school had alternated subjects for three years and found that students tended not to enrol in these if they were optional subjects; thus, the courses "disappeared" anyway. Where the alternated courses were core requirements, "the less mature students have much difficulty in coping, when forced to take these courses earlier than usual."

Semestering was a topic of much discussion among the principals whom we interviewed. According to their reports, some schools have moved to a semestered organization in order to attract students from other schools and,thus, to keep their own enrolments from decreasing. A principal from a large urban board recalled that there had been a push by the board five to eight years before to have the high schools adopt semestering. At that time, however, the teaching staffs in the various schools objected. After one high school reportedly was pressured by the administration into changing to semestering, "they ended up stealing a whole bunch of students from a nearby high school....As soon as that started, a whole bunch of other schools started to say, 'Hey, this is a way to get kids coming in.' So everybody started getting into the semester act; a lot of them had great proposals." However, the other schools protested to the board that a school should not be allowed to change to semestering just to get students who otherwise would have attended another school. According to the interviewee, the board had had to step in "to put the brakes on" so that schools must provide adequate justification for the change. The result was that several schools "had their plans shelved."

A principal of another school that had semestered the senior division in his school listed the reason as declining enrolments. His school enrolment increased by 40 students after the introduction of semestering,despite declining enrolments across the county. Some of the students came from non-semestered neighbouring schools, but others were simply students who were persuaded not to transfer to other semestered schools. Another principal wrote, "We switched to semestering to maintain our enrolment above 1,000 students."

A principal whose school is in Eastern Ontario also noted that he was very much in favour of semestering and that his staff was just about to adopt it, but the county board decided not to approve any organizational changes for another year. Their reason was that a five-year plan for all the secondary schools in the county was being developed and would likely lead to other changes in 1981.

A move to semestering does not always result in increasing a school's enrolment by drawing students from other attendance areas. One principal recalled that a couple of schools in his area had gone to semestering "purely on a panic basis," and at least one of them lost students because of that decision. While semestering does serve as an attraction to students, he argued that this occurs in the case of senior students (Grades 12 and 13) rather than for Grade 9 and 10 students. His school had rejected the change because the staff reasoned that it would not improve the student intake at Grade 9 and, if they could work to maintain enrolments through Grade 12 by reducing drop-outs, they would not have further concern. They felt it was not important for students in their rural area to attend a semestered school.

Another principal stated that his school took in a lot of Grade 9 students who would have attended a nearby school because the parents do not like semestering, especially when coupled with the open concept, as in the other school. Although his school loses some students at the senior end to semestered high schools, the increased intake in Grade 9 more than compensates for the loss. He had reports of very similar situations between other semestered and non-semestered high schools in various parts of the board. The semestered schools reportedly were losing so many potential Grade 9 students to non-semestered schools that the board sharply curtailed the transfer or open admissions policy. This kind of parental disapproval of semestering for Grade 9 students may explain why many principals reported that they have desemestered their Grade 9 and 10 programs and have left senior grades on a semestered organization. Among the reasons cited for desemestering Grades 9 and 10 are the shorter attention span of the younger student, and the necessity for continuity in subjects such as Mathematics, French and Music.

A negative evaluation of semestering was given by one principal who stated that a committee of seven teachers, seven students, and seven parents had been set up to investigate semestering for possible adoption in his school. All but two committee members (one teacher and one student) agreed that semestered courses could not cover as much curriculum as could courses taught across a whole year. They feared the loss of retention where students enrol in a course like Mathematics for only one semester per year. Further, the committee did not feel it appropriate for students to have a 72-minute lunch period and a 72-minute spare period each day. Finally, their school being small, they were concerned about students being able to get the combinations of courses they needed or desired (since there are few "slots" on the timetable each semester, with 72-minute periods). Another principal agreed that parents in particular want students to take a course all year long.

Several high schools earlier had adopted a half-credit, two-semester system of organization, in which class periods are usually the same length as under a traditional organization. A few years before, this organization, according to the principal of a medium-sized school, allowed them to offer a lot of optional courses that were suited to a half-year's work rather than a full year's work. "This allowed us a lot of fairly interesting and exotic courses." As enrolments declined, however, the principal found it difficult to timetable 16 courses per year per student (8 each semester). "All the permutations of timetabling 16 courses is horrendous enough even when you have a stable population." He "saw the handwriting on the wall" in timetabling for the previous school year, since they had drawn many fewer students than had been projected. Since they had been assigned staff on the basis of the projections, they were over-staffed that year; this was the only reason the timetabling was possible under the system. Thus, his staff decided to change the next year to a full-credit semestered organization which only requires that students be timetabled for 4 courses each semester or 8 per year (rather than the 16 under half-credit semestering). The staff formed several committees to revise the entire school program. Some courses and some combinations were eliminated. The offering of Level 6 (Enriched) courses was reduced and the reduction was justified because of the opening of two composite high schools in the area.

Another school that had been on a half-credit, two-semester organization for some 8 years had changed back to a traditional organization, primarily because the teachers "were a little bit tired of all the shuffle between semesters and only having a kid for five months and not really getting to know the kids well enough."

They have retained half-credit semestering for the occupations program. Several schools offer either half-credit or full-credit semestering for technical programs. A few principals stated that the longer periods allowed them to offer better courses in shops.

The principal of a medium-large high school reported that, over the previous several years, his staff had tried several patterns of organization including full-credit semestering and flexible modular scheduling. The latter required board permission to extend the school day, starting at 8:20 A.M. and ending at 4:00 P.M.; but in the end they were unable to build the kind of timetable they wanted because they offered too many courses. At that time, they were offering something like 390 different courses, including 6 difficulty levels in subjects like English, for example. Currently, the school has half-credit semestering for Levels 2 and 3 (occupations or modified and basic), for shops and for home economics.

A modification of full-credit semestering has been adopted by one of the high schools in Western Ontario. This school runs 70-minute extended periods with a single lunch period. The classes meet every other day and meet for the entire year. This has "slowed down the homework and makes the school a little more relaxed." The change from a schedule with three lunch periods to one with a longer, single lunch period has provided more time for intramurals and other extracurricular activities, an important factor for this small,rural school. Another high school, a large one, had introduced flexible modular scheduling at one time. "We just found it impossible to keep classes together in terms of where they were in the program. We'd get to examination time, and they were all over the place." The principal also stated that, if some activity or a snowy day caused a class to lose time, "it threw the whole thing out of kilter." The school ended up with a two-day tumbled schedule with 70-minute periods for classes meeting every second day.

Where schools had adopted a variation of the semestered organization, with class periods of less than 70 minutes (to allow students to enrol in more than four courses per semester), the Ministry's institution of required credits promoted a change in organization during the late 1970's. Ryan (in press) has documented one such case fully and speaks of two other cases. A third was mentioned by one interviewee from a rural high school. He had introduced a semestered organization with 65-minute periods plus unscheduled tutorial time. The Ministry of Education's insistence on full-credit value for required courses prompted "a complete overhaul" of the school's organization.

The organization of the high school (e.g. semestering) is not the only change affecting enrolments. As high schools compete with one another for students, the particular programs they offer provide incentives (or disincentives) to students. We were told about a situation in an urban area in which a high school had one of the largest Level 6 (Enriched) programs in the city. Another high school complained about the loss of its gifted students, and the board forced the "offending" school to stop "stealing from others." The competition among schools in terms of programs such as in this example led to a meeting of all the principals in the system. The principals reportedly had to "disclose every plan they had for the future in terms of programs and they had to be O.K.'d by the Board....As long as you weren't stealing students, they allowed you to go ahead with the program. But if you could be charged with that, then you weren't permitted to go ahead with it.... Principals found that a lot of good innovative programs they had thought about had to be shelved because of this intense competition."

Principals from the same urban board provided different views of the secondary school differentiation by program in the area. One was principal of a very large commercial high school which attracts students interested in business programs and also those who wish to enter employment or go to a community college after four years. Since a large proportion of the students are New Canadians, English as a Second Language (ESL) is a full department in the school and a major function of the school is seen as that of assimilating the New Canadians. He views the lack of composite high schools and the substitution of schools with specialized functions as having both advantages and disadvantages. In the context of decline, the competition among schools had become much more open. He views this as healthy "because it has forced us as secondary schools to establish much better contact with the feeder (elementary) schools so that they know what our whole program is like. There is nothing like a shrinking market to sharpen your marketing skills."

This kind of competition could be healthy if the schools respect the particular program functions they have been assigned. The clear specialization is not always maintained under the threat of decline, however. According to another principal, his small junior vocational school has never had a large Level 3 (basic) program because other schools in the system are "true Level 3 vocational schools with far better facilities and program" for these students. However, his school has excellent facilities and program for Levels 1 and 2 (occupations or modified) courses. He said that there had been an informal pact among the board's high school principals that the Level 3 schools would take no more than 15 Level 2 students and no Level 1 students---"In other words, they would take almost no students reading at below the Grade 5 level." As enrolments decline, however, the Level 3 schools are taking more than 15 Level 2 students. "So we're afraid now that they're going to be taking students that we would be getting otherwise."

A more cooperative solution has been found in at least one school board. A principal of a small high school reported that his school was "integrated" with another school across town. Neither school offers a full complement of subjects. Students can attend both schools half-time if they wish. "Eventually, courses that decline in number may have to be taught at one or the other of the schools." More information about the sharing of program, staff, and facilities among schools in presented in Chapter 5.

A complete change in program offering and a subsequent loss in student enrolment was reported by one principal because of the building of a French-language high school in his area. All French-language courses in his school (with the exception of Français) were cancelled. The loss of the French-language students also led to the cancellation of several English language offerings at the senior level (e.g., World Religions, Latin) and to the combination of senior level classes in History and Geography.

A final kind of impact of declining enrolments that has already been felt has been on the number of positions of responsibility in high schools. The principal of a large school stated, for example, that some department headships had disappeared over the past few years as enrolments in the courses in certain departments declined. Another principal reported that the headship structure in high schools had undergone a complete reorganization in his board three years ago. All existing positions were eliminated and new positions (in reduced numbers) were advertised and open to application from any qualified persons. "In our case, we went from 33 positions of responsibility to 16; the number is tied to your enrolment." While the changes in headships described here may be due to factors other than school declines in enrolments (e.g. board policy and declines in particular subject areas), a few principals spoke of the possibility that they may lose a vice-principal position where these positions are tied to enrolment in the school.

Decline in Enrolments in Particular Courses over Five School Years (1975-76 through 1979-80)

Questionnaire respondents were asked to list any subjects or courses for which there seemed to be a pronounced trend toward declining enrolment. Our assumption in asking this question was that enrolments in particular courses or subject areas might well have been affected by the numerous changes during the 1970's in Ministry policy regarding secondary education--e.g. the credit system and individual student choice of program, the emphasis on a diversified curriculum, and the return to a required core of subject. Moreover, we assumed that student choice of subjects might reflect societal priorities and changes in the economic milieu--for example, a shift in the very recent past to an emphasis upon preparation for employment.

Responses to this question were assigned to eleven board subject categories in order to facilitate computer analysis. Since the responses varied widely, and since particular courses might easily be assigned to more than one category, the data presented in Table 18 should be treated only as providing general indications rather than trends in specific courses.

The subject area that has been most affected by course enrolment declines up to the present is that of Languages, reported by one-third

Table 18

Trends in Enrolment Decline in Particular Subject Areas (1975-76 through 1979-80)

Subject Areas Declining[1]	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals
	Size of School				
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Classics	2 (3%)	16 (17%)	20 (17%)	5 (13%)	43 (14%)
Languages	15 (24%)	33 (36%)	38 (32%)	17 (45%)	103 (33%)
Arts	9 (14%)	20 (22%)	29 (24%)	6 (16%)	64 (21%)
Technical	9 (14%)	12 (13%)	22 (19%)	10 (26%)	53 (17%)
Science	8 (13%)	7 (8%)	17 (14%)	3 (8%)	35 (11%)
History	6 (10%)	25 (27%)	28 (24%)	8 (21%)	67 (22%)
Geography	8 (13%)	27 (29%)	25 (21%)	6 (16%)	66 (21%)
Social Sciences	5 (8%)	19 (21%)	17 (14%)	3 (8%)	44 (14%)
Physical Education	8 (13%)	10 (11%)	22 (19%)	8 (21%)	48 (15%)
Business	11 (18%)	14 (15%)	15 (13%)	1 (3%)	41 (12%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Some subject areas have arbitrarily been assigned several subjects,others only one.

of the principals. Schools in all size categories share this decline, but the large schools reported it most often. Decline seems to have affected more courses in the medium and large-sized schools and to a greater extent than has been the case for the small schools. In small schools, Business courses have been affected by enrolment declines to some extent, as have courses in Arts and Technical subject areas. With the exception of Languages, however, no subject area has been reported as affected by decline by as many as 20% of the small schools. A logical explanation is that the small schools do not offer as many options as do the larger schools. The medium-sized schools, both medium small and medium large, appear to have been most affected by enrolment declines in particular subject areas. This is logical in that the medium-sized schools are most apt to offer a fully comprehensive program with all four difficulty levels (see Table 14). In other words, students have more choices in those schools and enrolments in particular areas would be more subject to fluctuation. In addition to Languages, the medium-sized schools report fairly widespread declines in the areas of Arts, History, Geography, Technical, Physical Education, and Classics. The large schools, in addition to Languages, report declines in enrolment in Technical, History, Physical Education, Arts, and Geography subject areas.

Reasons for Declines in Enrolment in Particular Courses or Subjects

As stated above, we assumed that course enrolments would reflect the impact of the credit system, the shift to required subjects for Grades 9 and 10, and factors such as the social and economic climate. Thus, principals were asked to indicate the reasons for declines in the particular courses they had named in the previous question by checking one of four pre-coded categories: (1) changes in Ministry policy; (2) societal trends towards vocational subjects related to post-secondary employment; (3) student choice of less-demanding subjects; and (4) other reasons. It should be noted that we expected the Ministry policy or the new trend toward courses leading to post-secondary employment would likely cause enrolment declines in courses other than core and technical or vocational areas.

It was perhaps an oversight that we did not include a separate category about declining enrolment in the school in general as a possible reason for declines in specific courses. Our assumption was that general school decline would impact on total program and on the range of courses the school could offer. A specific question was asked about the latter and is discussed in Chapter 4. For Table 19, however, the "other reasons" category does include a few principals who mentioned impact of decline on specific courses with reference to the more general question. One should be careful, nevertheless, about generalizing the impact of Ministry policies or social factors on course declines in comparison with the impact of general school decline in enrolment.

Table 19

Reasons for Decline in Particular Courses or Subjects

Reasons for Decline	Size of School				Total[1]
	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Changes in Ministry Policy	12 (19%)	35 (38%)	44 (37%)	12 (32%)	103 (33%)
Societal trends	6 (10%)	14 (15%)	28 (23%)	10 (26%)	58 (19%)
Choice of less demanding subjects	19 (30%)	29 (32%)	34 (29%)	11 (29%)	93 (30%)
Other reasons	17 (27%)	35 (39%)	41 (35%)	12 (31%)	105 (34%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Non-responses and multiple responses account for column totals not equal to 100%.

The data in Table 19 suggest that changes in Ministry policy have had an effect upon course selection in at least one-third of the schools. The necessity of taking courses in core subject areas has resulted in declines in other subjects, especially in medium and large-sized schools. Principals in many small schools indicated that they have always maintained a core program. Consequently, the introduction by the Ministry of mandatory core subjects has little effect upon course selection in their schools. Some principals, albeit fewer, of middle-sized and large schools, also added similar comments.

The impact of societal trends upon the selection of vocational subjects related to post-secondary employment also seems more evident as school size increases, probably because only as schools get larger can they offer such programs. More than one-fourth of the large schools reported this as a reason for decline in other subject areas. Comments on the questionnaires suggest that, in small schools, there is less opportunity to select vocational subjects and the trend is not so evident. At the same time, the introduction of mandatory subjects in those smaller schools has meant that both students and staff have been drawn away from subjects that have a direct relationship to post-secondary employment.

The choice by students of less-demanding subjects was reported by almost one-third of the principals, and there were almost no differences based on size of school. Ironically, this question drew the most explosive comment received during the study. One secondary school principal returned his questionnaire with the comment that the implication that students would choose subjects just because they were easy so infuriated him that he refused to complete the questionnaire. He apparently failed to recognize the fact that many students may wish to enrol in less difficult options to complement a heavy schedule in other areas. Students seem more realistic. One group of students, when being interviewed in connection with a related study, for example, stated freely that in their semestered program, they tried to select one easier subject when they were timetabled to take three courses with heavy assignments. Others indicated that they took courses at an easier level so that they would have more free time--to work, or for pleasure and recreational activities. Judging from the principals' responses, a good many students do select at least some of their courses on this basis.

From one-fourth to one-third of the principals cited "other reasons" for pronounced decline of enrolments in specific areas of the curriculum. One principal wrote that, as the Francophone population in his area has increased from 60% to 70%, so has the request for additional French courses. "This means that the number of students taking English courses is limited and therefore accounts for the drop in enrolment in those courses." Another principal reported that courses in the technical area in his school were declining noticeably. He stated that this was not due to Ministry policy about required subjects. He believes the most important factor in this case is that of teachers' personalities. Another principal made a similar comment that student course selection "is influenced by quality of teaching and attitude of teachers." Teacher variables were noted by other principals as well. One of them wrote that "most enrolment declines are temporary and vary with student whims regarding timetable, teacher, and peer pressure." Another stated that some courses which had dropped in enrolment are "poorly presented by the teacher as being worthwhile and viable." Finally, enrolment drops in French were attributed by one principal to lack of interest on the part of his rural Anglophone community and by another as reflecting poor reception of the pressure placed upon elementary students to take French.

Several high schools have experienced changes in program organization because of student choice of subjects as opposed to declining enrolments in general. The principal of a fully composite school, for example, stated during one of the interviews that the school formerly had a four-year technical program in which the first year was a survey program. Students spent six weeks in six shop areas during the first year. This was dropped as being unsatisfactory, and Grade 9 students were simply allowed to enrol in Grade 10 technical courses. "We wanted to maintain the idea that a student would have a Grade 12 technical program upon graduation" even though the program had been reduced to a three-year one. The school had also dropped double credits in shops at one time because there had been a shift away from technical courses. This is now changing, and the technical program is drawing students into the school. Indeed, there is a waiting list for shops courses. Consequently, there is now a move back to double credits so that students can earn more credits in the technical program and so that courses will be long enough to allow for work completion. The principal attributes the increase in student interest in technical courses to media coverage about the lack of candidates for skilled trades.

The principal of another school noted that there seemed to be fewer students opting for advanced level courses and more opting for general level courses since more are choosing "with an eye to community college or employment after graduation." One principal wrote that the creation of a separate Occupations department in his school and the extension to a three-year program had helped his school to maintain and even increase enrolments, but it would also reduce enrolments in courses at other levels to some extent. These examples serve to illustrate that student choice of levels of difficulty may also lead to the reduction in courses at other levels.

The principal of a medium-sized school that had not faced declining enrolment and does not anticipate any such trend stated that Latin courses had been in difficulty for more than five years. The school has increased its classes in technical and business areas at the same time that there have been too few student demands for courses in other areas. "The decline in demands seems to be related to the fact that, having a broad choice, students choose on the basis of teacher personality, reported appeal of courses, etc."

These and other comments suggest that declining enrolments in particular courses and subject areas are the result of many and varied factors. While some of the reasons relate to the size of the school and its program diversity, to Ministry policy, or to societal trends, other causes may be found in the interplay of a host of contextual variables in the school and in the community. One of the important "other" variables is the teacher---his or her personality, attitudes, and teaching ability.

Cooperation with Other Organizations

A feature of many school programs is the cooperation that exists among schools and between a school and other community organizations, businesses and industry. Such cooperation adds flexibility and breadth to school programs and provides an excellent introduction to the world of work for participating students. The survey tried to identify patterns related to the nature and scope of cooperative programs and identified five areas of cooperation involving 10 per cent or more of schools of all sizes. As well, several individual schools had unique cooperative programs. Many principals indicated that they had been involved in cooperative programs for several years; others wrote that the concept was not applicable to their situations. The data are summarized in Table 20.

Work experience programs generally are organized so that a student spends a short period of time, usually from one to two weeks, working outside the school. Co-operative education programs are specifically-defined forms of work experience. According to Circular H.S.1: 1979-81, the in-school portion normally consumes one-third of the student's time, with work outside the school normally comprising two-thirds of the time. Regulations regarding credits and other specifications are described in Chapter 2. Both types of programs involve cooperation between the school and local businesses, industries, or companies.

Principals reported cooperative activities between the secondary school and three kinds of educational institutions: elementary schools, other secondary schools, and universities or community colleges (Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology). This type of cooperation usually involves sharing of facilities and/or staff, the latter in cases where students from one school attend a class in another. A variety of cooperative arrangements between the secondary school and community organizations or groups made up that response category. Such activities often involve community use of school facilities or, in turn, school use of community facilities such as libraries, swimming pools, bowling alleys.

Table 20

Cooperative Programs in Secondary Schools

	Size of School				
Program Description	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Work Experience	16 (25%)	33 (36%)	57 (48%)	13 (34%)	119 (38%)
Cooperative Education	4 (6%)	14 (15%)	21 (18%)	12 (32%)	51 (16%)
Cooperation with:					
Elementary School(s)	9 (14%)	12 (13%)	14 (12%)	3 (8%)	38 (12%)
Other Secondary School(s)	17 (27%)	13 (14%)	16 (13%)	5 (13%)	51 (16%)
Colleges and Universities	1 (2%)	2 (2%)	6 (5%)	3 (8%)	12 (4%)
Community Organizations	10 (16%)	15 (16%)	20 (17%)	3 (8%)	48 (15%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

Work experience programs have been the most popular form of co-operative effort to date. While 38% of all schools have some work experience program, this practice is most common in medium-large schools and least common in small schools (likely because there are insufficient "places" for student placement in rural communities and because the small school itself often offers only an academic program, as we have seen). Similarly, very few small schools have been able to introduce the co-operative education program. The latter is currently available primarily in large schools and, to a lesser extent, in medium-sized schools.

Cooperation with other elementary and secondary schools, in contrast to programs involving students' working in the community, is more common in small schools than it is in larger schools. This very likely reflects the adage, "Necessity is the mother of invention." Whatever the reason, more than one-fourth of the small schools cooperate with another secondary school in the sense of shared facilities or program. Although very few secondary schools report cooperative activities involving neighbouring colleges or universities, a slightly larger percentage of large schools than of other size schools do so. The large schools apparently do not have many cooperative activities involving community groups or organizations, whereas around 16% of the schools in each of the other categories reported activities of this type.

To get a flavour of the variety of cooperative activities reported by principals across the province, we selected a sample of comments written in response to the questionnaire item. These statements also provide, by implication, clues to the philosophies which characterize individual schools. The comments were organized by program description, as in Table 20. Some categories were combined. Each of the statements below is a direct quote from a secondary school principal.

Work Experience and Co-operative Education Programs

(Note: Many of the schools which reported some kind of work experience program also have some other kind of cooperative endeavours. Examples are provided in the "combination" category below.)

> "Alternative School - routing dropouts; life skill and work skill programs for our students."

> "An extensive work program involving over 130 local industries."

> "Work experience in commercial and technical subjects has been a practice for seven years."

Cooperation with Other Elementary or Secondary Schools

> "Selected Grade 8 students obtain a credit in year 1 Typing at the high school."

> "We are presently teaching 4 classes of shops from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily for a non-public school."

> "Neighbouring schools send us students for one semester who only have 3-4 credits required to graduate."

> "We are working with a neighbouring composite secondary school whereby some of our students are taking subjects not offered here (i.e. music, drafting) and some of their students are taking courses at this school not offered there (i.e. technical courses)."

> "A satellite class from the Haven School for the trainable mentally retarded is operating in our school this year."

> "We share a music teacher with the elementary school. We take all grade 13 students from the (other) secondary school. Students may elect courses in either secondary school."

"We are working fairly closely with the Board's night school program which has expanded this year to include several credit course offerings."

Cooperative Activities with Community Groups or Organizations

"Community library used as a teaching area for one English course twice a month. All recreational facilities, arena, pool, school gymnasium are on a cooperative basis."

"We have a chaplaincy counselling program whereby one member of the clergy is available each morning to any interested student."

"Youth Centre offers dance, music, gymnastics, etc. courses in our building (300 youngsters)."

"Local industries provide technical shops with great quantities of surplus materials (wood, metal) free of charge."

"Our library has an inter-library loan plan with the Public Library and other schools."

Combinations of Cooperative Programs and Activities

"Grade XII Phys. Ed. uses local facilities - Bowling Alley, Riding Stables, Ice Rink, Golf Course.
- Occupations and Grade XII Commercial and Technical students all have a work experience program.
- Family Studies Grade XI students visit individually a Child Care Centre for experience.
- Occupations and Family Studies have contact with police, health units, etc."

"We get great cooperation with all facets of our community - work experience, resource material, ministerial, Legion, Lion's Club, women's groups, etc. We are attempting to enlarge our work experience programme this year to include occupational, technical and commercial students in trades, mills, etc.
- Alternative schools - for those students who lack a few credits for a diploma."

"The House Building Program has been a boon to our technical budget and extremely meaningful to our Senior Fabrication Students.
- Cooperative Education - our two-day cycle enables the kids to be in school one day and on the job the next. We have kids at Radio Stations, in Marketing, Municipal Offices, the Penal Institution, Simpson's Sears, Law Offices,etc. The employers and the kids are thrilled. We also have about 12 adults who have returned to upgrade or pick up new secretarial skills, a tremendous market that hasn't been tapped.
- Our Math Department takes Grade 8 students in their Grade IX Program - great for the gifted child."

Summary

In this chapter, we have presented information about Ontario secondary schools as they are entering what is predicated to be a decade of declining enrolments. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, one should neither expect decline to impact with the same intensity nor to the same extent on schools located in very different kinds of communities, some of which are still growing in population.

For the purposes of this study, schools were sorted by size into four arbitrarily defined categories (i.e., small = fewer than 600 students; medium small = 600 to 999; medium large = 1,000 to 1,500; large = more than 1,500 students). We recognize that the "cut-off" points between categories are arbitrary, and that a change of enrolment of one student could change a school's category but would rarely change a school's program. Nevertheless, the categorization by size has merit for purposes of data analysis. The tables presented in this chapter reveal that size of school has some relationship to other school characteristics and to program and organization. The strength of this relationship should be tested further against a host of other viables, both external to the school and internal to the school.

In terms of school characteristics, we found that the majority of schools use English as the language of instruction. French language schools and bilingual schools (the latter with two exceptions) were either medium-sized or small. While the majority of the secondary schools in the sample offer Grades 9-13, some 37% of the small schools cannot offer Grade 13.

There were differences between schools in the various size categories in terms of the difficulty levels of courses that they offer. Modified level courses generally are offered by around one-third of the small or medium-sized schools, but only by approximately 20% of the large schools. Basic level courses are found in more medium-small schools (83%) than in the schools in any other size category. Some 97% of the medium-large and large schools offer courses at the general and advanced levels. In contrast, around one-fourth of the small schools do not offer advanced level courses.

There is a further relationship between size and the particular combination of difficulty levels available to students. The most common pattern across the province was the combination of general, advanced, and basic level courses, a pattern which provides all but the modified level appropriate for Occupations or exceptional students. However, only 22% of the small schools had this pattern. For them, the most common pattern (38% of the small schools) was to offer only general and advanced level courses. Only 6% of the small schools offered the full range of difficulty levels, compared with one-fourth of the medium-sized schools which offer all four levels. Indeed, it is the medium-sized schools rather than the large schools which have attempted to offer fully comprehensive programs to a significant degree. Because of this, the medium-sized schools will likely find their programs most affected in nature by declining enrolments.

Turning to the extent of decline, we pointed out in the introduction to this chapter that the full impact of decline on secondary schools is not expected to be felt until around 1983 or 1984. Thus, it is not surprising that only 35% of the schools in our sample have already been declining across the past five years, with another 14% just beginning to decline in enrolments. About one-fourth of the schools still have steady enrolment patterns and the others are still experiencing increases in enrolment. Some of the principals whom we interviewed, however, told us of startling enrolment projections, the most drastic of which involves a 63% reduction in student enrolment between the school's peak enrolment and its projected enrolment in 1984. It appears that the rate of decline will be highest in medium-sized schools, particularly those in urban areas.

The examination of organizational and program changes in high schools during the past five years reveals that the majority of schools have not had to introduce extensive organizational changes to date. However, this situation may change, as we shall see in the next chapter. One type of change reported by as many as one-fourth of the principals during the recent past has been the "stacking" of classes into courses of more than one difficulty level and/or more than one grade level. This practice, and the strategy of offering courses in alternate years, is reflective of school size and will likely increase as enrolments decline. Some schools, including one-fourth of the large schools, have moved to a semestered organization in recent years. Many principals look on the adoption of semestering as a means of attempting to draw in students from non-semestered schools and, thus, to offset decline. While a variety of other types of organizational changes were described, it is important to remember that none of these changes were characteristic of a majority of schools. Further, of the changes already introduced, only 13% were reported as being caused by enrolment declines and only 6% were attributed to Ministry regulations. A repeat of this study after another five years might well show a much different provincial picture.

Further, this chapter presented information about declining enrolments that had occurred over the past five years in particular courses or subjects. The subject area that has been most affected in the recent past, according to the questionnaire responses, is that of Languages. This is followed by declines in the areas of Arts, History, and Geography. There appears to be little relationship between school size and declining enrolments in particular subject areas. That is, all schools are experiencing decreasing student choices in the same subject areas. Nevertheless, there is a relationship between size of school and extent of decline in these areas. Specifically, larger percentages of medium-sized schools report declines across most of the areas affected. Further, smaller percentages of small schools than of schools in any other size category report declines in any subject areas except that of Business, Science, and Physical Education. Because programs in small schools have often been limited to core academic subjects anyway, there is less room for fluctuations among subject areas.

In describing the reasons for declining enrolments in particular subject areas, it is clear that there has been an impact because of the Ministry of Education policy change to compulsory subjects. However, student choice of less demanding subjects was also very important as a factor. Some 30% of the principals gave other reasons for the changes. A great many of these also reflected student choices, not of easy courses, but of courses selected because of teacher personality, attitudes, and abilities. In analyzing the reasons for course enrolment fluctuations, it is evident that small schools are less vulnerable than are larger schools to changes in societal trends or even to the Ministry change to compulsories (which comprised most of their program, anyway). The medium-sized schools appear most vulnerable in this regard, likely because they have offered more options for student choice.

We found that secondary schools engage in a wide variety of co-operative activities with other schools, organizations, or community groups. Work experience programs involving local business and industry was the most commonly reported type of cooperative venture, followed by co-operative education programs, cooperation with other secondary schools, and cooperation with community organizations. Again, size had a relationship to the type of cooperative activity. Small schools were less likely to have work experience programs than were schools in other categories, and very, very few of them had a co-operative education program. The medium-sized schools led in numbers of work experience programs, while the large schools did so in terms of co-operative education programs. In contrast, proportionately more small schools than larger ones reported a cooperative activity with an elementary school or with another secondary school, probably because they have either to share program or sacrifice program.

Discussion

As this chapter has shown, size of school has at least a moderate relationship with school program. Clearly, individual schools deviate from the pattern within any arbitrarily defined size category. One can offer generalizations, however, for most schools within a size range. We offer some generalizations here, based upon the findings in our study and those reported in Rideout et al. (1977).

Most of the small schools have never been in a position of being able to offer a wide variety of options for students at a variety of difficulty levels. Many of them have never been able to offer technical and vocational subjects or a full range of commercial subjects. For this reason, the Ministry change to compulsory subjects in Grades 9 and 10 had little effect on the small schools. In essence, the Ministry had defined as compulsory most of what already was the school program. Further, changes in societal trends or educational priorities that impinge on the kinds and variety of options offered to students affect small schools less than they affect larger schools. The small schools are much less likely to be able to adapt the school program to meet a special need or emphasis. Small schools, nevertheless, are subject to an internal factor that has nothing to do with size per se. That is, student choice of "easy" subjects or choice of subjects taught by a "good" teacher affects enrolments in the courses offered just as it does in schools of larger size.

Small schools also feel some impact of Ministry policy changes, albeit not to the same extent as in other schools. Certain options have had to be withdrawn in order to provide staff for core curricula. The necessity of providing core courses at various levels of difficulty has posed at least two sets of problems. One is related to the problems of numbers of courses. Small schools find it particularly difficult, if not impossible, to staff courses at all levels of difficulty. The problem is compounded by the fact that only small numbers of students enrol in courses at basic or modified levels. Around one-fourth of the small schools are not even able to offer an advanced level. It is not economically feasible to mount many small classes. Related to the first problem is the second. Regulations 704 and 407 stipulate the necessary qualifications for teachers in specific programs, and 704 also sets the maximum size for special education classes. Since every school has a set number of staff members based upon a predetermined pupil-teacher ratio, the assignment of teachers to small classes means that other classes must be enlarged. Small schools also may lack a full staff of persons qualified in a wide range of subject areas.

In spite of the restrictions posed by size of staff and student numbers, small schools cope, some more satisfactorily than others. The need to provide courses at various levels of difficulty is often met to some extent by stacking classes, either by combining levels of difficulty or by combining grades. The success of this practice, we are told, varies with the combination of students involved, the skill and attitude of the teacher, and the general philosophy of the school. The combination of basic and general levels is reportedly more often unsatisfactory than is the combination of advanced and general levels. Either combination is obviously better in the hands of a teacher who teaches to each group in the combined class, than it is in the hands of a teacher who teaches as if all the students were at a common level. Unfortunately, small schools are often located in small school boards where there are few subject consultants to assist in developing materials and guides for use in such combination classes.

The practice of offering courses in alternate years is a commonly used device for coping with small enrolments. Although the procedure seems reasonably sound, one should keep in mind the observation that optional subjects which are alternated tend to disappear. The same principal who made that observation noted that less-mature students have difficulty in coping with core courses when forced to take them at a younger age than usual.

Small schools are less likely than larger schools to be involved in cooperative education or work experience programs since, lacking facilities and staff in the technical and vocational areas, they may not have sought out opportunities for work experience programs in those areas for their students. The limited job market for vocational students in small communities may be a further consideration. However, while we recognize that they have some real difficulties, and especially in rural areas, we note that some small rural schools have indeed managed to find work opportunities for their students. As well, small schools do seem to cooperate more with other neighbouring schools in the sharing of facilities and programs.

As we shall see in the next chapter, declining enrolment has the unfortunate consequence that many teachers are declared surplus or redundant. The reaction to that consequence has been a major effort on the part of the teachers' federations to protect their members, through collective agreements with school boards. The direct impact of these agreements is upon workload, pupil-teacher ratio, and class size, each of which indirectly affects teacher surplus and redundancy. Collective agreements vary from board to board. As a matter of interest we have noted some variation between schools in the degree to which principals can gain the cooperation of teachers in exceeding workload and class size provisions in the agreement. It is fair to say that teachers in small schools generally have carried a heavier workload in the sense of more course preparations and more instructional periods than have their peers in larger schools (who may, in turn, generally have had larger class sizes). As declining enrolment increases, the small-school principal may find his teachers less willing to exceed negotiated limits.

The terms of reference for this study called for a focus especially on large and small schools. However, we found that medium-sized schools are the ones more likely to undergo change in the very nature of their school programs as enrolment decline accelerates. In this chapter, we have seen that medium-sized schools are those which have made the most visible efforts to provide comprehensive programs at a full range of difficulty levels. Like large schools, they have had enough students in the past to offer many of the newer courses in line with curricular guidelines, and to maintain the full academic program. However, to a greater extent than in large schools, declining enrolment lessens the possibility that enrolments in the various courses will remain at viable levels.

As we shall see in the next chapter, some program reduction is expected in most schools because of decline in the total enrolment in the school. As decisions about reduction are taken, student choice of courses will be more likely to "save" new, innovative courses than many of the senior level, academic courses, if student choice alone determines school program. A good many schools report few degrees of freedom with respect to negotiated workload limits, and exceptions are often met with grievances. Staff surplus and redundancy decisions may leave a lack of staff with qualifications necessary to maintain the full range of courses and programs they have proudly introduced. In short, the generalizations made for small schools may be applicable in the next five years to a good many schools that currently are in the medium-sized category. Rideout (1977), for example, predicts that the percentage of Ontario secondary schools in the under-400 category will rise from 8% to almost one-third of all the high schools in the province. Many of these schools stand to lose a good part of what they once had as their program.

References

Rideout, E. Brock; Murray, John S.; Sylvestor, Christine; and Harris, Marion. Educational, Social, and Financial Implications to School Boards of Declining Enrolments. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1977.

Ryan, Doris W. Flexible Scheduling: Evaluation of the Scheduling Organization at Hillcrest High School. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, in press.

4

The Impacts of Declining Enrolments, Collective Agreements, and Government Regulations and Priorities on Secondary School Program and Organization

As the information in Chapters 2 and 3 suggests, a host of factors other than decline already profoundly affect program organization in secondary schools. However, the collective impact of these factors will be exacerbated in the 1980's by declining enrolments. Survival, not only of particular courses or subject areas but also of particular schools themselves, will become problematic. By the middle of the decade, few secondary schools in the province will enjoy the "luxury" of having to accommodate only to changes in Ministry or Government requirements, societal expectations, teacher demands during negotiations, or even student choice of courses. While the particular difficulties they will face and the possible alternatives they can reasonably consider will vary, most schools will feel the impact of declining enrolments.

It is difficult to separate the impact of decline on school program and staffing from the impact of collective agreements and Ministry or Government requirements and priorities. In reality, all these factors interact in affecting the school's program organization and program delivery. Nevertheless, we have attempted to treat these three major factors as analytically separate. This chapter is devoted to analyses of these factors as they impact on the school and on the principal's managerial role. The date presented were collected from written comments on the provincial survey of secondary school principals (Appendix A) and from discussions during interviews with 30 principals.[1]

---

[1] These comments and discussions, although correctly reported, sometimes reflect differences of interpretation and/or misinformation regarding Ministry policies. We have footnoted some of the more obvious instances of misinformation.

As principals discussed these issues, we observed that many are already working with school staff to find innovative or alternative ways of preserving program. A few are working with staff to redefine objectives in order to guide decisions about program reduction and even additions. Such internal school efforts are very worthwhile. However, in at least some areas of the province, unless solutions to problems are sought from across-school boundaries, it may be very difficult to provide even an approximation of equality of educational opportunity. Although such alternatives are the subject of discussion in Chapters 5 and 6, we argue that solutions should be sought in the light of full knowledge of the problems faced at the school level. It is toward the definition of the problems that this chapter is addressed.

THE IMPACT OF DECLINING ENROLMENTS

Reduction of program is the major concern of secondary school principals when they speak about the effect of declining enrolment. This concern is expressed by principals of very small schools and of very large schools. In essence, what the principals realize is that declining enrolments directly affect the size of the school, and size of school has a definite relationship to program, both from the standpoint of viable class sizes and also from the standpoint of adequate staff numbers and qualifications. Nevertheless, while the concern about decreasing size leading to program reduction is universally expressed, the nature and extent of anticipated program reduction differs among principals whose schools already vary in size and program.

Staff members and students from small secondary schools (schools with enrolments of less than 600) have been aware, for a long time, of the relationship between size and program. For them, declining enrolments mean even more restrictions on what often is already a fairly narrowly defined, academic program. Such schools have never been able to provide a "supermarket" of courses at a range of difficulty levels. For small schools becoming smaller, the "trauma" of decline will come in the fear of school closure. The minimal impact of decline will involve cutting back the program a bit more, stretching staff resources a bit more, combining grades and levels, or finding alternative ways of offering program.

In contrast, schools that have been very large, with more than 1,500 students, typically have offered a wide range of courses and depending upon the students served, a wide range of difficulty levels. For schools with enrolments of more than 2,000, decline may be viewed with a small sigh of relief. Declines in the current enrolment of several percentage points will still result in a school size conducive to offering a diversified program. While program reduction in large schools will occur, therefore, the reduction will come in some of the many optional subjects or in terms of the "stacking" of courses now offered at various levels of difficulty. Minimal impact likely will involve some reduction in the numbers of sections available for one course. It is difficult to foresee a "trauma" of decline for the very large secondary schools.

The medium-sized secondary schools, ranging in size from 600 to 1,500 students, may well be more than "caught in the middle." The majority of Ontario's secondary schools now fall into this category. Clearly, the schools with from 600 to 900 students are relatively small now and face many of the difficulties that smaller schools face in trying to offer a diversified program. Decline will affect them in much the same way as it will affect smaller schools, except that they may have more options available for elimination before having to turn to changes in core program. The medium-large secondary schools, with more than 1,000 students, may well face the greatest intensity or "trauma" of decline. Having introduced a diversified program for the students they serve, they have more to lose with decline. For some, combining difficulty levels or grade levels within courses will be sufficient to forestall more drastic reductions in program. For others, however, the extent of decline will be such as to significantly change the school program.

As observed in Chapter 3, many of the medium-large secondary schools (in which enrolments have reached between 1,000 and 1,500 for several years) will experience a rate of decline that will place them in the small or medium-small school category before 1990. For some of them, the "trauma" of decline will come in the form of a drastically curtailed program, a loss of what they have had, a redefinition of the purposes of their program. It is difficult to equate the impact of a reduction of 90 students in a school of 390 students with a reduction of 752 students in a school that formerly had 1,225 students. The 300 students who will atend the first school in 1984 may have to select courses from a program somewhat more limited than that available to their sisters and brothers who attended the school during the 1970's. However, the 475 students attending the second school in 1984 likely will select courses from a school program completely different from that available to their older sisters and brothers during the 1970's. A vicious cycle ensues as parents look for a larger school to which to send their children, thus further accelerating the rate of decline.

What will the program be like for schools reduced by decline to fewer than 600 students? An answer may be found by considering the characteristics of schools that are already small. On the questionnaire to principals, we asked for comments about the ways that the size of school and/or declining enrolment had restricted the range of program offered. Since the question was asked in the past tense, respondents tended to be principals of small or medium-small schools or of schools already in decline. Many principals left this question blank or commented that it was not yet applicable to them. The responses of small-school principals describe the relationship between size and program.

Examples of the already restricted program in small schools were given by several principals. For example, one commented that "School size has demanded a very traditional program." Another stated that his school is unable to offer a technical program or Art. A third wrote that, because of the size of the school, they were unable to offer Grade 13. A fourth commented that his school cannot offer enough programs for all the secondary school students in the community. "Close to half of the students from the secondary school panel travel 42 miles a day to go to two other high schools." Another small school principal wrote, "We have maintained ranges, but staff is suffering from burn-out." Finally, a principal explained that his school has to limit the number of students in technical and commercial subjects because of the lack of facilities and monies. As an example, he noted that only one-third of the students wanting to take Welding could be accommodated.

Principals of some medium-sized schools also wrote comments about size and program. For example, one stated, "The size of our school is mainly responsible for our ability to run only a limited program in Art and Music, and no program in Agriculture, although we live in a strong agricultural area." Several commented about not being able to offer a range of difficulty levels in all subject areas.

The kind of program restrictions described above may become more common in the province during the 1980's. Principals tend to speak of three major kinds of impact of decline: elimination of courses, reduction in levels, and school closure. Each of these is discussed in the subsections that follow.

Elimination of Courses

Although a good many principals provided no answers to the questionnaire item which inquired about the ways that size of school and/or declining enrolment has restricted the range of program which might be offered, 23% wrote in responses indicating fewer course offerings. One-third of the principals of small schools, 26% of those from medium-small schools, 15% of the principals from medium-large schools, and 21% of the large school principals identified this restriction. As noted, the question was worded in the past tense. It became clear during the interviews that, had the question been worded with reference to the next decade, the response rate would have been much greater.

It must be remembered that Ministry diploma requirements involving core subjects in Grades 9 and 10 "protect" these subjects from total elimination. However, because they are required, the Ministry has urged secondary schools to provide a range of difficulty levels in each core subject. Decline will limit the school's ability to meet that recommendation. Beyond required core subjects, the information in Chapter 3 indicates that student choice of optional subjects has already led to small enrolments in some areas of the school program. Thus, as the total school enrolment decreases, decline will vary across the subject areas within a school. Courses attracting smaller student enrolments will be obvious targets for elimination, regardless of their pedagogical merit, unless alternatives such as "stacking" are employed.

The principal of a medium-sized school wrote, "Each reduction in total school size means a reduction in program balance throughout the school." In his school, decline meant that each year he would be reducing shops. The principal of another medium-sized secondary school also stated that many senior shop classes in his school would have to be cancelled soon because of declining enrolment. A third medium-sized school principal pointed out that his school was reducing options at the senior level "at the rate of two per year." Another stated that, although his school board had allowed them a very low pupil-teacher ratio (14.5:1) in the past, so that the school could offer parallel programs in French language, "restrictions are coming." Finally, from a medium-sized school came the following response:

> Size of school dictates the number of teachers allocated. When a school gets below 1,000, and 60 of these are occupations students, the size of the senior school gets to the point where options have to be cut. When this happens, others leave to get these subjects at another school, which further aggravates the problem--a snowball effect.

The particular options that are cut are often determined by the extent of student choices from among the courses or programs offered in the school. Another factor may be availability of teachers with the specialization needed, as we shall see later. A third factor is the overall nature of the school program. For example, if a school tends to have a large business program and a small technical program, the latter may be eliminated or reduced further with declining enrolments.

Several principals spoke of reductions in the technical area. One medium-sized school already has eliminated Electronics and another expects Electronics to "disappear" next year. Art was mentioned for likely cutbacks or elimination by several principals. One principal stated that his staff was faced now with the decision of dropping German. Another stated that, although his community has a large number of German residents, there were only 12 Grade 9 students this year who requested a beginning German course. Thus, the school has decided to offer beginning German only on alternate years, so that both Grade 9 and 10 students will enrol and make up a viable class of around 23 or 24 students. This same principal stated that the Music program in his school will be eliminated, since there were currently only 28 students from Grade 9 - 13 who were interested in Music courses.

A good many principals wrote or spoke of the timetabling conflicts and reduction in flexibility brought about by having too many single-section courses, a problem that increases as size decreases. While there are some single-section courses in Grades 9 and 10 in many schools, this is much more common at the senior level where there are only two required credits (in English or Anglais). Examples from Grades 9 and 10 came from a large school, in which the principal stated that they were having to combine technical classes in particular; and from a medium-sized school where the Grade 9 Art course was dropped. Many more examples were given for senior level courses. The principal of a medium-sized school wrote that his school had more and more "singleton" sections, with many options apparently "competing with one another." The result has been that "Moderns, Music, and Geography are falling off. Many technical courses have combined year levels (e.g. Grade 11 and 12 Electricity) taught together." The principal of a large school commented that declining enrolment had been felt primarily at the Grade 13 level. His school dropped Portugese and Geography this year. "The majority of our Grade 13 classes are small, which results in larger classes for the other grades. The same effects are starting to appear in Grade 12."

The effects of competition among optional subjects was discussed by one of our interview groups. One of the principals talked about the fact that his staff was concerned that the school offered an imbalance of business courses in comparison with other program areas. A particular bone of contention was that the Business Mathematics course, "which is legally a Math course, is directly competing with our Phase 2 (basic) Math course." The staff may decide to drop Business Mathematics. These comments led another principal to add that his school is also considering dropping Business Mathematics for a different reason, namely, low enrolments. He has already had calls from two parents who "threaten" to send their children to another school if that program is dropped. He stated that the parents want "security", an assurance that what their children want to take will be offered.

The principals of two large schools had varying views about the impact of decline, likely reflecting a difference already present in their approaches to program. One of them stated that his school was down to "a nice size" for a composite school--around 1,200--and he doesn't expect much program contraction. "Our program hasn't gone hog-wild like some have in terms of individualization and a multitude of offerings. We don't have 28 English courses in Grade 9--that sort of thing--so there isn't that much room for core contraction." His school, however, may have to reduce optional areas such as technical, business, Theatre Arts and the like, and perhaps run a three-year program in Latin rather than a four-year program. The other principal stated that it was core areas rather than optional areas that would be affected by decline in his school. They expect about 100 fewer Grade 9 students to enrol next year. Since only a fraction of that 100 might have taken Typing, Music, Home Economics, Art or technical courses, those areas are not affected so much and are not likely to lose teachers. But each of the 100 would have taken English, Math, Science, and Geography---"Those are the subjects that the decline is hitting."

Many principals are involving staff in making decisions related to program reduction. The principal of a small school, for example, stated that they would either have to sacrifice some options or make classes in core areas "considerably larger." He is involving his total staff in that policy decision because it will call for some kind of sacrifices on their part. Another principal mentioned that Grades 12 and 13 have already been combined in both German and Latin, but these will be "the first to go." At the moment, these combined courses are being preserved because the teachers have voluntarily taken them on as extra courses beyond the contractual workload. In the year that has just passed, four teachers carried an extra class voluntarily rather than see the courses disappear.

The principal of a fairly large school concluded that there would have to be some "shrinkage" of the school's curriculum because about one-third of the courses were already taught in single classes. He has asked the school's department heads to establish criteria and guidelines for a "modification and trimming of the program that's carefully thought through." He is desirous of making "intelligent" decisions by anticipating curricular changes:

> We don't want the curriculum to shrink purely on the demands of the marketplace. We don't want to wait to see the options the kids choose and then mark off the bottom ten courses. That scares me because there are educational considerations that we have to deal with.

Where reduction means the total elimination of a course, some principals are allowing students to enrol in correspondence courses as a last resort. According to what we were told, the principal must grant the admission to the correspondence course for full-time senior level students. One principal stated that, when his school had to eliminate a Calculus course (Grade 13), a number of students asked to take this by correspondence. The school's Mathematics department head agreed to help the students with their assignments. Although the completion rate of correspondence courses had been "very bad" until the last couple of years, this principal said that they have recently had "more and more kids finishing them off."

Another principal's reaction was: "You are sort of robbing the hand that feeds you, in the sense that you need that credit in your school to maintain or build up your numbers." He too has seen a great increase in the number of students enrolling in correspondence courses. While he tries to screen the applicants carefully, parents put pressure on the principal to agree to the correspondence course for their youngsters. "They find out that their kids can't study on their own. Completion rate depends on the type of student who enrols in it," he said. The ability of the school to provide correspondence students with assistance and supervision is also another critical factor leading to the successful completion of the courses.

Combining Grade Levels and Difficulty Levels

Another kind of program reduction is the reorganization of courses into multi-grade or multi-level provisions. While this kind of "stacking" usually involves two adjacent grade levels or difficulty levels (or both), a further type of program reorganization is that of zero-level courses or open courses, in which any student of any grade level or ability may enrol. This type of program reduction likely has been used for a long time by small secondary schools, but it appears to be becoming more and more commonplace among schools of all sizes as enrolments decline.

One could argue that, if there were good, pedagogically-sound reasons for strongly encouraging schools to offer courses at varying levels of difficulty to accommodate differences among individual students, the practice of "stacking" is not desirable. As we shall see later, however, a good many principals believe that inadequate general level programs were developed in the past so that the needs of many students have not been met effectively by offering separate general level courses.

Nevertheless, the task of meeting the needs of students in classes containing more than one grade level or difficulty level may be even more burdensome. Such combinations may preserve program in one sense, but they may well not meet individual student needs unless curriculum guidelines, instructional guidelines, and relevant professional development activities are available to provide guidance for teachers.

The principal of a fairly large school that has had from 600 to 650 pupils in Grade 9 in the past said that the school had traditionally offered Grade 9 courses at a wide range of levels. Within a year, the Grade 9 cohort will be down to 350 so that the school must cut back on the choices of levels available. "I think Grade 9 is a critical year, and I think that we have to take a careful look at the teacher's strategy." Several principals mentioned the need to do more than merely reduce the number of single-level courses. One possibility, according to the principal of a medium-sized school that currently offers courses at four levels, is to have the students elect the difficulty level upon which each one will be taught and evaluated, and then to have the teacher (in a "stacked" course) make an adjustment accordingly in the evaluation of each student; thus, multi-level and even multi-grade courses in subjects such as Languages or Art are already being used "because the nature of the subject is more individualized, and the teacher can accommodate student differences."

Entering Grade 9 students are often advised by their parents to elect advanced level courses even though the feeder school has recommended general level, according to the principal of a medium-small school. The result is that, of 46 students in Grade 9 History, for example, 11 are in the general level and 35 are in the advanced level class. By Grade 12, he explained that there is a more reasonable distribution of numbers between the two levels. His school next year will divide the entering Grade 9 students into two classes, both of which will combine general and advanced levels. The teacher of each class will have to "sort them out". A nearby school had tried "actually sorting them in two classes in each class and tried to teach them differently." A principal from a different region, however, warned that the Federation affiliate in his jurisdiction had taken a strong stand on the matter and had grieved two cases of courses combining general and advanced levels. He said that the combined classes were disbanded as a result. This might force a school to move to open level courses, although schools in his area have never had open courses in subjects like English or History.

One of the principals had conducted a survey in his school and found that "if a student is taking 4 level (general) English, you'll find he's taking no 5 level (advanced) courses." This applied, he concluded, to 90% of the students in his school. Thus, he is considering a reorganization in which Grade 9 groups of students would be identified and hand-timetabled to move as a group to the core subjects at least. He observed that "As the Ministry eventually moves toward core programs, it is almost that way now." Timetabling by group would avoid conflicts where single-section courses are offered. If the principal timetables the core courses by groups of students, there could be "two scramble periods" for the electives, a pattern that was common before timetables were individualized. While this would alleviate the need to combine levels (assuming that electives were open-level courses), the principal anticipates some staff dissension as teachers want either to be in the core or to teach one of the electives.

Various subject areas and courses were identified by principals as onesin which a combination of levels and/or of grades will be introduced. Geography in both Grade 11 and 12, for example, was one mentioned often as now having combined general and advanced levels. Some schools, however, chose to combine Grade 11 general level with Grade 12 general level and to combine the advanced level classes for both grades. At least two interviewees mentioned offering Physics one year and Chemistry the next year, so that many Grade 11 students would be taking what used to be a Grade 12 course. Alternate year offerings of Grade 13 courses also cause students to enrol in some of these while still at the Grade 12 level.

Another very common trend appears to be the offering of senior shops, with no course distinction between Grade 11 and 12 students. As one principal explained, "We don't see any of our shops--drafting, electricity, machine shop, or woodworking--disappearing. They will simply be amalgamated as a senior shop program instead of different shops at two-year levels." Courses like Machine Shops lend themselves to a multi-grade organization, according to another principal, because students can be given individualized projects.

Open level or zero level courses were also discussed. Such courses are open to all students, but they are not recommended by the Ministry of Education. One principal called it a "horrible trap to fall into", but he agreed that there is an ever-increasing number of cases of Grade 11, 12 and 13 students all in the same Spanish class, for example. He saw this as an unfortunate compromise made to avoid loss of the program. Another principal, however, stated that senior level courses such as Grade 12 History were simply disappearing, since students elect the open level Man in Society course. He argued that growth led to the establishment of new courses, but in decline it is the traditional courses like History and Geography that are disappearing, not the new courses. "They take exactly the same thing and call it 'Man in Society' and everybody will love it...Maybe it's handled in a different way."

Another principal admitted that his school has too many zero level courses, "and the teachers have not got in their heads which ones in the class are sort of general level and which ones are more advanced level." The result is that "it is the general level kid who is failing in that larger class mixture." Other principals in his group agreed that this was happening over the whole province. His answer was to have the student choose the level, put students in the same classroom and have them taught in the same way, but to insist that course assignments, projects, and student evaluation differ according to the level selected.

Special concerns were expressed about the impact of declining enrolment on Occupations programs and on modified and basic level courses. Whatever the label, these courses are designed for students who range from needing remedial work to those who have more serious learning problems. One principal explained that his staff first considered combining Grade 9 basic and general level courses, but they decided it was better to combine Grades 9 and 10 basic levels into a single course and combine Grades 9 and 10 in general level courses. This would mean that the teacher would at least have students who "have basically the same ability", although some are older. The school found that this was working well and was "keeping programs going---it's the little red schoolhouse operating."

One of the principals stated that many students who enrol in general level courses "cannot handle it", so they offer a basic level. For next year, however, this program has been "virtually eliminated." Declining enrolment has so reduced the number of basic level students that they will offer only general and advanced levels starting next year. Another principal also had a school situation in which there were no longer enough students requesting basic level to make up a class. In compulsory credit areas like English and Math, however, he has two "compatible" staff members timetable similarly so that they team teach these subject. "One may be instructing while the other one is giving individual help (to basic-level youngsters in the combined class); it worked out very well." Another principal is experimenting with having a single teacher teaching four of the Grade 9 required subjects to a group of students who need remedial assistance.

A good many secondary schools offer basic-level courses only at the Grade 9 and 10 levels, and sometimes only for English and Mathematics. One principal explained that his school had tried offering basic level courses in Science, History and Geography, "but the students simply wouldn't take them...So a student who can't get his Canadian Geography or Canadian History at the general level is in a lot of trouble." Even in a large school, a principal commented that declining enrolments were limiting the number of basic level subjects offered because of the smaller class sizes and the subsequent lack of teacher resources.

Competition among schools for students is evidently affecting some basic-level programs. For example, a school that was "involved early" in developing a specialized program for basic level students at a time "when the rest of the principals in the county weren't interested in having them" now finds that the other schools want these students. He said that his school scarcely had enough of these students to run the program, and the other schools certainly won't have. He fears that they will lose what is a "solid program" that cuts across the four years---"The whole thing might collapse." Others in the group agreed that schools were competing with each other as enrolments decline. As one summarized it, "That concept comes through now, loud and clear, that we are in the business of selling education." He plans to make "damn sure the kids think this school is better than that one or that one."

A different situation was described by a principal who was beginning to have too few students for the basic level courses. The situation was described as a circle, starting with declining enrolments. As the school responded by placing basic-level students in general level courses, the basic-level students "felt a little under the gun...having to go up to the Phase 3 standards, even though the teachers did their best to slope them and grade them a little differently." This led to students leaving to attend a collegiate with a large Phase 2 program. His school lost 37 students to other schools last year because of a reduction in Phase 2 basic and in some unphased options. This loss completes the circle as the further decline leads to further program reduction, to more students leaving, etc. The large collegiate in his county ended up with 100 students more than had been projected, while everyone else was down. There seemed to be a "wave of fear right across the county---students running into the office and asking for transfers." If you interview them later, he stated, the students will tell you, "I was afraid to get into your program---not enough kids, so you might cancel it. I don't want to take that chance." This was true also of students who wanted particular options like Art or Computer Science.

We were told about the policy decision made by one school board years ago that all secondary schools would offer composite programs. As a result, one school that had been a Phase 1 (Occupations or modified) school was designated as a regular high school and lost the extra teachers needed to operate a complete Occupations program. The principal of another school in the county said that there were now more Phase 1 students attending other schools than were attending the former vocational school. His school had developed three single-credit shop programs "deliberately tailored for these students" and a girls' occupational program that included hairdressing, food preparation, food services, and the like. All of this had been introduced despite the fact that the former vocational school had available "a much better range of programs." The girls' program in his school disappeared three years ago because there were not enough students to warrant the expense. He now has only nine students "who are truly Phase 1, so the rest of the program will disappear---there's no question about that." His view is that it is unfair to the students to "patch together" programs by combining grades and levels and work experience programs. The solution that seems reasonable to him is to have one Phase 1 school in the county which would accommodate all these students. He admits they would have a "terrible job" trying to change back, because there is a "fear of labelling students." So he feels they are a long way from that solution.

Some schools offer the modified (or Occupations) level only for Grades 9 and 10. If the students return for a third year, according to one principal, they enter the mainstream, usually in a general level program. The guidance counsellors help decide whether to place them into the Grade 10 stream, perhaps with some Grade 9 courses or even some Grade 11 courses. He said that students in Occupations programs often take general level Mathematics "as they go through." Another principal stated that they were putting such youngsters into a basic level program in Grade 11, along with some Grade 9 general level students who "flunk out badly in June---this fills up a class."

School Closure

Perhaps the most drastic kind of impact of declining enrolment is school closure. Surprisingly, the few principals who mentioned this possibility were at least somewhat supportive of it as an alternative to a school with very limited program. One of the medium-large schools in an urban area will decline from more than 1,200 students to less than 500 according to projections. The principal attributed this massive decline to the building of too many secondary schools within a single area. His statement, which is given below, illustrates the dilemma:

> What we're doing right now, quite frankly, is trying to plug holes wherever we can...It's not fair to the staff who, in my view, work much harder in smaller schools...It's not fair to the students in the community if there is supposed to be equality of opportunity that's not being provided at schools where population shrinks. I have very grave concerns about that sort of thing.
>
> This is the problem. We have to go to senior administration; we have to go to Federation; we have to go to the parents. We need to take a look at the real needs of the school in declining enrolment. Maybe the ultimate need is to close it. But I think that is a final step to take.

The principal of a small junior vocational school in an urban area spoke of his school as a "likely target to be closed because it's small; it's a self-contained school that could easily be turned over to something else." The programs offered in his school are being accommodated now in three fairly close neighbourhood schools--"As a matter of fact, they can offer them in a much more sophisticated way because they've got better equipment, better facilities." If he were asked what would happen to the students if his school were closed, the principal concluded that he would answer that they could all be accommodated in neighbourhood vocational schools with minimal social adjustment and no disruption in their program. His school is distinct because it is an all-girl school, and students come from all over the city because of "parental desire to have their daughters in an all-girl school."

A principal from Eastern Ontario wondered "whether the Ministry wouldn't be wise in making it more advantageous for boards to close schools." He was of the opinion that there were too many schools in his urban area, and consolidation could keep programs going. He spoke of his present concern that it is very, very difficult to get staff "enthused about creative, innovative uses of space and of teaching strengths because the board tends not to encourage that special thing." The staff will begin to ask whether it is worthwhile "to get involved with all the hassles of getting a new program going, all the extra work, if we can't get any special support into our school." He also observed that the average age of staff was now 41. With the decline that is projected and the subsequent loss of younger teachers, the average age of staff would be over 50 by 1984, with the youngest person being 41 years of age. "That's a very narrow range. These are not the most innovative people; they're not as flexible as they used to be."

From Western Ontario, a principal described his community as a "bedroom community" from which many adults drive to work in one of the nearby urban areas. He stated that small schools like his (fewer than 350 students) are being considered for "very possible closure, and we're fighting for our lives in many ways." The numbers of students in some Grade 13 courses, for example, range from 5 to 8. "The administration, the board, looks and says, 'How can we justify that to the taxpayer?'" If the school loses its Grade 13 program to a nearby school, the Grade 12 students may follow, and "that sort of thing can build up all the way back down eventually to Grade 9." Unlike the other three principals, he is opposed to school closure and is "desperately trying to come up with all kinds of arguments not to lose our 13." They have lowered the examination marks leading to recommendations for Grade 13 courses, and they are encouraging Grade 12 students to take Grade 13 courses "to try to keep our student credit ratio as high as possible." He concluded that, if the Ministry eliminates Grade 13 altogether, "that would be a whole different ball game."

The Impact of Collective Agreements

On the questionnaire for principals, one item asked: "During the past few years, what effects have collective agreements between your board and teachers' federations had upon school program?" Note that the question once again was worded in the past tense since the survey was designed to collect information about current situations. Thus, many principals again wrote in that the question was not applicable as yet. The responses that we did receive were coded according to the aspect of the agreements that caused a program effect: negotiated pupil-teacher ratios, maximum class sizes, workload restrictions, and teacher surplus-redundancy policies and procedures. A few responses were classified as "other" when it was unclear which aspect of the agreement was being addressed. Table 21 reports the findings.

TABLE 21

Collective Agreement Clauses
Affecting School Programs
(1975-76 through 1979-80)

Size of School

Clause Related to Program Effect	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals [1]
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Workload	17 (27%)	24 (26%)	27 (23%)	5 (13%)	73 (23%)
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	5 (8%)	10 (11%)	15 (13%)	5 (13%)	35 (11%)
Class Size	4 (6%)	15 (16%)	10 (8%)	1 (3%)	30 (10%)
Surplus-Redundancy	5 (8%)	9 (10%)	7 (6%)	0 -	21 (7%)
Other	3 (5%)	5 (5%)	4 (3%)	0 -	12 (4%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Non response and multiple responses account for column totals not equal to 100%.

Almost one-fourth of the principals offered a response that reported an effect on school program of workload clauses in the collective agreement. Features of the agreement that define or delimit a teacher's workload (e.g. number of student contacts, number of preparations, or number of teaching periods) were reported by more principals from small schools (17, or 27%) and from medium-small schools (24, or 26%). This may well be due to the fact that teachers in smaller schools in the past have often carried a workload heavier than the provincial average. Restrictions in collective agreements seem to be changing that situation, as we shall see. The other aspects of collective agreements appear to have had little effect to date. Certainly, most collective agreements negotiated during 1979 carry some provision related to teacher surplus and redundancy (see Chapter 2). However, these provisions have not likely affected program significantly up to now as declining enrolments have yet to take their full toll.

An analysis of the comments of principals in response to the question reveals a range of views about the impact on school program. The emotional content of these views ranged from extremely negative to enthusiastically positive. Although there were more negative than positive views, there were many who thought that agreements had led to improvements. For example, one principal wrote, "A vigorous agreement has brought about significant positive attitude changes in staff. This is evident in an extremely healthy and vigorous extracurricular program."

During the interviews, principals spoke at length about the type of impact they anticipate over the next few years as decline accelerates. Their comments reflected a primarily, though not uniformly, negative view of the effects of agreements on school program. Further, workload clauses seemed less important in affecting program in the future than did clauses or memoranda of agreement regarding teacher surplus and redundancy. Thus, had the questionnaire item been coupled with another asking about effects to come during the next five years, we posit that the response rate would have been much greater and that the types of impact would have been more widespread than the focus on workload during the recent past. As one principal wrote in response to the survey question, "We may have to operate on a tightrope in the near future. Presently, programs are not really adversely affected."

Our data, both from the questionnaires and the interviews, also suggest regional differences which should be explored. There are obviously differences among boards with respect to the nature of the collective agreements (see Chapter 2). Such differences may follow regional lines. Teachers from small schools in small boards, for example, seem not to force principals to "live up to the letter of the law." They seem more willing to negotiate their workload on an individual basis with the principal. This appears to be much less the case in urban situations. There were also some differences within school boards in the principals' reports of past and current effects. Such differences may reflect varying school sizes, rates of decline, and/or relationships between principal and staff.

In the absence of declining enrolments, the trend toward defining the teacher's working conditions in collective agreements likely would have only limited effect on the principal's flexibility in program scheduling and timetabling. The situation is very different with declining enrolments, however. Thus, the discussions that follow are essentially still reflective of the impact of declining enrolments on school program since decline, we suggest, changes the nature of the impact of collective agreements.

An astute comment was written in by a principal who argued:

> It is getting more difficult to assign teachers classes outside their preferred areas of expertise because they are fearful of being declared surplus. Collective agreements contain more and more contradictory clauses--e.g., school staffing of PTR-17.5, but caps on class size and pupil-teacher contacts are sometimes incompatible.

This quotation illustrates the interrelationships that occur among pupil-teacher ratio, class size, and workload limitations.

The negotiated pupil-teacher ratio defines the number of teachers to be assigned, either to the system or to the individual schools within a system. Given the upper limit of teaching positions for his or her school, a principal begins to plan the schedule of course assignments for teachers and to develop the timetable of classes (number of sections per course, distribution of courses through the school day, and the like). Any negotiated restrictions on teacher preparations and number of instructional periods per day affect the principal's schedule of teacher assignments and the total number of courses he or she can timetable. Where class sizes or pupil contacts have been included in the contract or in memoranda of agreement, the principal must timetable students accordingly, rescheduling students where course choices have not been accommodated. In some cases, either maximal class sizes or pupil contacts vary according to the type of program or student, e.g., levels of difficulty in core courses, technical courses, occupations programs.

Obviously, secondary schools differ not only in terms of contents of collective agreements but also in the degree to which school staff are involved in decisions about program offerings, scheduling and timetabling. A more subtle difference is the kind of relationship that has been developed or has emerged between the principal and the teachers in a school. The interview discussions revealed the range of such differences. As an illustration, a principal complained in one group meeting that he had a staff, or a group within the staff, "who are constantly challenging the school administration about the way in which they organize the school." He continued,

> And I'm willing to stand behind the decisions I make on an educational basis, but it gets tiring after a while to have to continually defend them against arguments like 'We don't need a Family Studies program anyway; they can learn that at home'....And by and large, in our jurisdiction, the people active in federation work tend to be traditional academic teachers, so you get that added thrust.

Another principal in the group reacted by saying he had not had that kind of problem in his school. He thought it was because his board's contract and working agreement were different. He said,

> Our staff understands that each individual principal will prepare an allocation of sections, based on numbers and on the overall agreement, and will present that to the staff and say, 'Okay, now if you can do it any better than I can, show me.' And that's what I've done. So I don't get that (second-guessing).

The first three subsections below deal with pupil-teacher ratio, class size, and instructional workload. The reader should bear in mind that such clauses or provisions are interrelated in terms of affecting the principal's responsibility for scheduling and timetabling to provide the school's program for students. The fourth subsection examines provisions for declaring teachers to be surplus or redundant. We have already pointed out that agreements reached between boards and federations with regard to teacher surplus and redundancy will take on increasing importance in program provision as enrolment decline increases. Indeed, the basis for surplus and redundancy decisions (e.g. seniority) will largely determine the particular individuals who remain and whose skills and qualifications will shape the nature of the school program.

A final word of explanation is needed. When we speak of collective agreements, we are also including board policies and memoranda of agreement between boards and teachers. The policies or memoranda are sometimes recognized in the contract and thus become a part of the contract and are subject to grievance. In other cases, contracts do not include provisions regarding pupil-teacher ratio and the like and do not refer to board policies or memoranda of agreement. In these situations, board policy or administrative procedures apply and are not grievable.

Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Principals reported a variety of ways in which the pupil-teacher ratio for a school is determined. Of 43 secondary collective agreements for 1979-80 on file with the Education Relations Commissions at the time our data were gathered, 35 included some provision related to pupil-teacher ratio. Most frequently, this was a ratio for the secondary panel in the entire board or school system (see Chapter 2). A different method for arriving at the pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) was described by a principal from a board in which the secondary teachers were on strike at the time. His County Board has established a Personnel Complement Committee, made up of teachers, trustees, and administrators. After each principal provides the projected enrolment for his school for the next school year, the committee agrees on a maximum complement of teachers in the County. The total figure is then subdivided into the various schools. The principal stated that once the figure is established it cannot be changed unless circumstances change substantially between March and September.

Several principals spoke of their involvement in negotiating with central administrators about the PTR for the system and for individual schools. For example, an interviewee commented that there was a very strong principals' association in his County. "Most of us aren't afraid to speak out (with senior officials)." He said that the principals had got together and structured their own method of dealing with surplus staff. They also argue PTR's. This principal had rather strong feelings about administrators beyond the level of principal.

> Beyond a principal, they're no longer educators when it comes to staffing (decisions). And anybody who says they are is an Alice in Wonderland. They're statisticians; they are board appeasers. They know how much money they've got, they know how many teachers they can afford, and then they say, 'Here's how many teachers you have but, for goodness sake, don't destroy any programs when it comes to our little numbers, boys.'

He argued that principals, especially strong principals, should never become a part of senior management because "we can see both sides of the picture so darn clearly." He added that the few principals who operated in the group according to self-interest and whose motivation was to move into senior administration were overruled by the group.

In another County Board, we were told that the principals put in their projected enrolment figure (and a figure for staff), and the Director's administrative assistant puts in his figures. The Director then makes a decision between them. According to the interviewee,

> Very interestingly, we're always at complete extremes. The administrative assistant comes out with a figure that's very low; we come out with a figure that's very realistic; the director comes out with one that we don't agree with. Unfortunately, it's between the two of them...
>
> Last year, we (the principals) predicted 12,245 students in the County. We enrolled 12,224...Now, you can't get much more accurate than that...yet we weren't allowed to have that figure (the staff numbers that accord with the projected enrolment) because it wasn't a nice figure--it meant two more teachers. Financially, they said they couldn't afford it. We said, 'Are you interested in kids? You might be, but that's after you set the staffing figure.'

Once the Director makes his decision, the principals more or less compete with each other to arrive at an agreed to PTR for each school. Distinctions are made among schools of various kinds.

A principal of a small secondary school noted that principals in his board also compete with each other in setting PTR's for each school, once the board's total staffing figure is set. Where there is some "give-and-take", the smaller school gets special consideration. The other principals, he said, realize that teachers in the smaller school have at least four or five preparations. Thus, the small school often gets a lower PTR. The principal of a fairly large school stated that he had been given a lower PTR in order to maintain the co-operative education program and other innovative programs. In reaction to his comments, another principal in the group said that his board's joint teacher-trustee committee (which decides school PTR's) would never have permitted that because it would require some other schools to have a higher PTR. The first principal agreed there would be such pressure in the future, but he said he would retaliate by saying they would have to eliminate these new programs that are keeping or bringing in more students.

The collective agreement in one County Board calls for two kinds of formulas, the traditional PTR and a credits staffing program. The latter involves a certain divisor for academic credits, a divisor for technical credits, and the like. According to an interviewee, every principal found that the credits staffing program yielded fewer teachers than did the PTR formula. The federation is now attempting to negotiate a smaller divisor. The board also has a five-year staffing program added to the collective agreement. This provision provides management flexibility for programming in that it allows a leeway of 2% more or 2% less than the PTR figure. The Director then has the right to maintain a slightly higher PTR for a few years to keep programs that might otherwise be eliminated because they need specialized teachers. The collective agreement also includes a provision for improved student services. Under this, schools are allowed extra teachers to cover classes for department heads so that the heads may "look after the kids more in their department."

In some boards, the agreement provides for teachers of special programs (outside the normal PTR). For example, one principal stated that each school in his system was allowed half a teacher for the next few years to provide for the new co-operative education program. He was granted an additional 1.2 teachers last year to provide special education. These special program provisions simply specify additional staff not dependent upon formula. The principal said that, because the Government seemed likely to pass the new Special Education legislation (see Chapter 2), the numbers of extra teachers allowed each school for special education programs will rise. In another board, a principal informed us, every secondary school is allowed at least one remedial reading teacher outside the PTR.

Thus, some principals conclude that the collective agreement has been a help in the matter of setting the number of teaching positions. As one principal wrote on the questionnaire, "The collective agreement has given schools additional staff to work with and, thus, has made it possible to retain program in spite of a slight decline in enrolment." Other principals were not so pleased with the agreement negotiated in their boards, as we have seen.

Class Size

More and more collective agreements carry clauses related to class size. Of 43 agreements for 1979-80 which we examined, 23 contained a class size provision for individual schools (see Chapter 2). In about one-third of the cases, there is a maximum class size mandated. More often, the provisions served as guidelines, leaving some flexibility for the principal.

A few principals in our study sample were from boards that had agreed to maximum class sizes. They spoke of the program implications of this mandate. One of them stated, for example, that the maximum class size for his school was 30 students. "There are no ifs, ands,or buts; if you have 36 kids in a class, you go to the kids and pull them out." His board has not yet set a minimal class size. Rather. he works with a Superintendent in determining minimal sizes and, thus, possibly eliminating courses. On the questionnaire, a principal wrote that his board had agreed to a maximal class size of 34 for academic classes and 20 for technical or home economics classes. "The result is pressure being placed on small classes, of which there can be quite a number when the school is composite and includes Grades 9 to 13."

Ever since Bill 100 allowed working conditions to be part of the collective agreement, a principal concluded, there has been a continuing desire on the part of teachers' federations to control class sizes. "We're moving from the 'wherever possible' type of clause to mandated maximum class sizes." He believes these mandated maxima will present "extremely serious" problems in jurisdictions (like his) where there is significant decline. An example of the kind of problem he foresaw was the case where 40 students begin a machine shop program in Grade 9 and only 12 or so continue the program at the senior level. At the moment, he is able to run the program for the 12 or so students "so they can complete what they started two to four years ago." If he had to abide by class size maxima, he would not be able to spare a teacher for a class of only 12 students.

Where maximum class sizes are specified in the collective agreement, teachers may grieve if the principal timetables more than the maximum students into a class. We were told of a situation on one such board where there reportedly were 400 grievances in a single year. Where the agreement provides only guidelines for class sizes, we were informed by one principal that teachers cannot grieve against the principal. Instead, they may bring a problem to the principal and ask for justification. The principal explained that he then had to prove that there was a legitimate timetable concern involved in exceeding the guidelines. He mentioned that one department in his school was now over the guidelines by 43 students. He told the teachers in that department that they had two alternatives: "teach them or you tell the 43 kids that they can't have that program." If they grieve, they're grieving "over there", i.e. at the board level rather than at the school level. This principal believed that the central administrators perhaps should be making the hard decisions about which programs to cut, since they are the ones "telling us how many staff members we can have." As for himself, he said,

> I don't refuse any kid a program that's within my staff structure. As long as I assign my staff, if some guy's got 20 kids too many, that's too bad. It's a legitimate timetable concern. I don't worry about it in the least. (Note: It appears that this principal may have been speaking of total pupil contacts rather than individual class size.)

A principal whose board has agreed to include class sizes in the agreement with teachers said that the provision carries the loophole of "wherever possible." The size stipulation is also over the whole school day and differs according to program and phase (i.e. difficulty level). The district branch of the federation may grieve on behalf of all the teachers. The grievance is to the superintendent rather than to the principal. Nevertheless, the interviewee stated that grievances have an impact on staff morale.

The move to specify class sizes as part of the collective agreement was seen by a few interviewees as forcing principals "to make readjustments in order to maintain program." This was exemplified in actions taken by one principal to adjust enrolments in a third Mathematics course which he felt should be available in Grade 13 because it was critical for those who were specializing in Mathematics. If he could not get a sufficient number of students to enrol in the course, the memorandum of agreement with his board dictated that the course must be cancelled. The cancellation proviso had been demanded by management in retaliation for negotiated maximum class sizes. Both the federation and the principals' group question its merit. A principal from another board informed us that his board was beginning to look at minimum numbers for course enrolments as a result of maximums being demanded by the teachers. He agreed that this could cause course-offering problems in the near future.

Class size guidelines often are tied to program and difficulty level. One principal spoke of trying to staff basic level courses at 16 students per class and general level courses at a relatively low class size. These procedures forced him to staff advanced level classes "as high as you can possibly push it, much to the detriment of our advanced level students." He saw this as a serious problem, both for students and for teacher morale. Another principal wrote that his board's agreement states that basic level courses shall not have more than 20 students. Given the constraints of the overall pupil-teacher ratio, principals in his board "must consider the overload caused in academic subjects by having too many basic courses."

Some boards appear to have been able to withstand the pressure by teachers for specified class sizes and to preserve the principal's flexibility. A principal wrote, for example, that his board so far had avoided maximum or minimum class sizes. The flexibility this has provided him has allowed him to maintain smaller classes at the expense of some larger ones. Another principal said in one of the interviews that, although his board's agreement specified maximum class size guidelines by program and difficulty level, principals do not have to abide by them. Because it is discretionary, teachers cannot grieve. Instead, they may take complaints to a Committee of Teachers and Trustees. A similar situation is present in another board from which a principal reported that a few of his teachers willingly accept some oversize classes in the interests of the program and the students.

Most principals, nonetheless, would likely agree with the statement written on a questionnaire: "Timetabling becomes more of a mathematical than a human problem with the introduction of collective agreement clauses on ratio and class sizes." A group of interviewees got into a poignant exchange about these issues. One of the group members expressed his hope that we will not see an increase in the number of school systems that have agreements limiting the number of students per class or limiting the number of classes a teacher can teach. Such restrictions reduce program flexibility in the best of times. With declining enrolments, flexibility is even more sharply curtailed.

The threat to program flexibility, according to another member of the group, requires special leadership, from the principal especially but also from the Ministry. The principal, in the first place, must organize and use staff wisely, no matter what the PTR provides in staff numbers, in order to keep class sizes as reasonable as possible. If principals do not do so, teachers will pressure for defined class sizes that are acceptable. The speaker said that his board had one of the highest pupil-teacher ratios in the province, but class sizes in his school compare very favourably. One reason is that other schools give their department heads significantly more time to perform headship duties than he does, and this shows in class sizes. The Ministry's responsibility, as expressed in this interview session, is to ensure that decline and its implications are clearly understood by teachers. The rest is up to the principal in involving his or her staff in program decisions. A summary of the remarks of a principal who felt strongly about this issue follows:

> You mentioned that the head may have a reduced load...The implication for other teachers is clear. I think the same thing applies if you decide within the school that Grade 13 Latin shall be kept even though there are only 5 students in it--that has implications for larger classes elsewhere. My feeling is (that) how the administration deals with that decision and with the mood of the teachers is important. If it is imposed and there is not enough consultation, so that teachers won't understand the implications of keeping certain programs at small enrolments and compensating with larger classes elsewhere, then teachers are more inclined to look to the collective agreement for protection.
>
> On the other hand, I think the principal, the heads of departments, and the vice-principals who make (final) decisions have to draw the line somewhere. They have to say, 'Look, this is a good course, and it's an interesting thing to teach and valuable to the students, but we just can't afford to offer it. We're paying too high a price elsewhere in the program or within the department'...
>
> I think this is something that we as administrators have to learn. Look at the 1960's when there was buoyant growth..this was the last kind of problem a principal had. But now it is a problem, and how we handle it has probably more implications than collective agreements. If we don't handle it well, I don't think there is any question that there will be impositions within collective agreements...
>
> When you look at the schedule in most schools, there is tremendous variation from one teacher to another in terms of student contacts through the cycle. That's very explosive, or at least delicate. My approach, within the heads committee, is to say, 'Eliminate a Grade 13 program, for example, when the classes are too small.' The

> decision to maintain that program and have compensating larger classes elsewhere is a decision that belongs to that group of people.
>
> I'll be darned if I am going to make that decision, not because I'm afraid of it. It's easy---one stroke of the pen and you wipe it away. But I think the staff has to really appreciate the implications of making that decision...
>
> If you want a really good problem in relation to declining enrolment, it is the decision-making process in coping with decline. It's O.K. for me in the principal's office to say decline offers opportunities, but that isn't worth the powder to blow it off the desk, frankly, if the rest of the staff doesn't see declining enrolment in the same light. That's for sure.

Teacher Workload

In Chapter 2, we pointed out that negotiated restrictions on instructional load create greater potential constraints on program than do maximum class sizes. Further, 34 of the 43 agreements for 1979-80 which we examined included some kind of workload clause. Mandated class size limits are obviously but a special kind of workload provision. Other provisions deal with reduced course loads for teachers with administrative responsibility (heads), numbers of course preparations, numbers of periods or minutes of instructional time, numbers of consecutive instructional periods, maximum number of pupil contacts during a day or cycle, and the like (see Chapter 2).

Principals differ about restrictions seen to result from workload provisions in collective agreements. For a few, it appears that there is enough flexibility left so that the principal or the department heads have some discretionary rights. In these cases, principals tend to view the collective agreement favourably or neutrally. For example, a principal who was interviewed said that the agreement had narrowed the gap between teachers who teach fewer than 100 students and those who teach 180, so that most now teach at around the 120-130 level. It should be noted, however, that this principal also reported that the traditional PTR formula had been replaced with a system that provided more teaching positions. In his county, the lowered PTR formula had allowed them "to retain a lot of staff who normally would have been fired in other jurisdictions." Thus, the pupil-contact provision had been compensated for by a lowered PTR for school staffing. The principal of a different school also thought the collective agreement provided some degree of uniformity within schools which was desirable, but he admitted that their agreement was not highly restrictive.

Although his board has a memorandum of agreement which provides pupil contact limits and "is a little bit of a headache in setting up your timetable", one principal said that he simply turns it over to the department heads to let their people decide which courses they want to teach. If their decisions mean that pupil contacts will go beyond the agreement, the heads must "get it in writing that they want to teach those courses." He conceded that their contract is not as "tight" as others around, and this may explain why it does not cause serious problems. Another administrative "headache", he said, is that he now has to turn in reports in May and September on the number of classes, their average sizes, and the teacher-pupil contact for all staff and especially for those whose situations exceed the memorandum of agreement.

A reasonably favourable reaction was expressed by a principal who wrote that his board's collective agreement states maximum teaching loads per cycle, with a "tolerance" of 5% allowed per department. "This ensures that teachers are protected against a too heavy workload." The collective agreement also gives teachers the right to decide whether or not they will do supervisory duties at noon. He recognized that this could be a problem, but his teachers, fortunately, have agreed to perform this duty. Another principal wrote that individual teachers will, on a one-year basis, agree to teach seven classes rather than six to accommodate a small class. A third example from the questionnaire responses was that of a principal who noted that his teachers had been cooperative and had agreed to exceed the negotiated contract in their supervisory duties. Nevertheless, a "tightening" of PTR by "Board edict" has resulted in the loss of some low enrolment courses.

Aside from these kinds of responses, most principals reported negative impacts on program already being experienced or anticipated as decline increases the difficulty of timetabling to meet negotiated workload restrictions. Some 15 of the 44 agreements that we examined, for instance, included a provision regarding released time of teachers in positions of responsibility. There is some movement toward specifying the number of such positions for a school. We noted above that the number of such positions, and the amount of released time these positions carry, affects the class sizes and total workload of other teachers. In The Class Size Question, Ryan and Greenfield (1975) found that provincial secondary schools averaged one-third of the teaching staff in positions of responsibility, regardless of the total number of teachers on the school staff. Whether the province's secondary schools still follow this pattern is unknown. One principal wrote on the questionnaire that his school used to have many chairmanships in addition to heads, but they have now been replaced with five area heads. In contrast, one of the interviewed principals revealed that 11 of 22 staff members in his school were paid some kind of responsibility allowance. He said that the federation had insisted on it and placed a provision in the collective agreement-- "to that effect." As one of his peers remarked, "He has as many Chiefs as he has Indians."

In responding to the questionnaire item about the impact of collective agreements, some principals provided indications that decline may put pressure on teachers to resist exceptions to the agreement. One of these statements was that inflexibility had increased as teachers who previously accepted duties over the maximum daily assignment are now grieving any over-size classes, extra preparation, or above maximum teaching assignments. Although the department heads in his school had agreed to have the same teaching load as regular teachers, another principal described the agreement's impact as restrictive. A few teachers, he said, indicated an interest in teaching seven classes, but would not because the agreement sets six classes as a maximum.

The move toward six teaching periods out of eight, according to a third respondent, has caused him to have to drop certain subjects. Another contributing cause was the fact that senior students are beginning to elect a supervised study rather than take an extra course for credit. Flexibility on teaching assignments, wrote another principal, has been reduced because of the mandated student-teacher contact time in the agreement. Since his agreement stipulates that having four teaching periods in a row, for example, is a "no-no", yet another principal found it necessary to ask a teacher's permission to break the contract from time to time.

A principal, in responding to the questionnaire item, wrote:

> Disastrous! Since the strike in Metro Toronto, teachers are unwilling in many cases to assume supervision unless it is part of the load, or time considerations are given.

Another principal wrote that the board's attitude towards the rigid collective agreement they now have has caused "backlash" among some teachers with regard to supervision. More specifically, teachers feel

"If that's their opinion of my efforts in the school, then why should I do the extra things such as supervision?"

A small school is especially hurt by these attitudes and restrictions. In the past, recalled a small-school principal in an interview, a teacher would be proud to take on the coaching of a school team outside of regular hours. In return, the principal would "give them all the breaks you could on extra supervision during the day" and the like. Currently, as more things have to be put on paper, the principal will not be able to offer such incentives. This will be especially true in small schools, he fears.

Teacher workload is going to have to increase significantly with declining enrolments, opined a principal, regardless of collective agreements. He had observed that technical and business teachers in composite high schools already may have to teach five different courses. In the academic area, on the other hand, teachers "aren't prepared to have more than three courses to prepare at the most." As decline brings more single section courses, either teacher workload in terms of course preparations must rise or the number of academic courses offered must contract. The provision to reduce the total number of teaching assignments from seven periods to six has already resulted in the cancellation of some classes, according to the principal of another school.

In summary, the majority of principals surveyed or interviewed would agree with one of their peers who wrote:

> Collective agreements have significantly limited the flexibility individual schools have enjoyed (and used responsibly) by undue emphasis in the agreement on C.W.Q.E. (conditions of work for quality education), workload indices, definitions which weren't needed and now are a limitation, etc.

As another principal put it, the collective agreement has been "centred on the fact that management rights are prerogatives of the teachers and not necessarily the principals or the administration or the Board." As a result, he said, some of the freedom to staff the schools has been removed.

Collective agreements, then, are changing the role of the principal. In the past, according to our interviewees, a principal could balance situations between a teacher teaching seven periods and one teaching six periods by giving the latter more supervisory duties. As one principal saw it, "That is pretty well going by the boards now; we're getting to the point where everybody is trying to do the same thing." Indeed, he argued that the move to uniformity, as opposed to allowing principals to balance workloads individually, was creating problems in the equality of workloads. The agreement's mandates do not take into account an overview where English teachers, for example, usually have a lot of marking and Math teachers have a small amount of marking. In trying to treat everybody at the same level, "they don't consider that; they just consider bodies."

The extremes to which a collective agreement can go in defining and delimiting workload were illustrated by a principal from a board in which there reportedly had been over 100 grievances last year. "We have just about everything you can think of covered in the contract", he lamented, which greatly limits the flexibility of the principal and vice-principal in timetabling the school. Their contract "lays down" a desirable number of pupil contacts for every type of student and the desirable number of periods. While these are not "firm", they are grievable. Average class sizes are firmly mandated by type of student (i.e. general or advanced level). If a teacher teaches courses at both levels, the principal has to ensure that the teacher's classes do not exceed the class average for each level. The teacher cannot be over the class size average in one level and under the average in another, so there is no possibility of balancing. The number of preparations is supposed to be three and is grievable as well. Thus, the principal has to deal with four restrictions in timetabling: average class sizes, total number of students taught, number of periods assigned, and number of course preparations. Each restriction must be considered for each individual teacher. Exceptions to the restrictions for a teacher can only be approved by formal waiver of the teacher and the president of the district teachers' federation.

At the moment, many collective agreements still allow some discretion for the principal in seeking teacher cooperation. Where such discretion exists, the manner in which a principal involves the teachers becomes very important. One principal related how he seeks cooperation of the whole staff:

> We present our draft timetable to the staff--number of teachers, number of sections per subject area. We may say, 'That means you're going to have to teach two Law courses this year, Jimmy, and four Phys. Ed. But surely you don't want me to give your buddy one less Phys. Ed. so he can take one of your Law courses. I think it's better if you both share the grief.'

Once 40 staff members see the whole timetabling picture, any "vocal guy who wants it all his way" is drowned out by the other 39. At any grievance hearing that follows, the principal said that he then is representing the other 39 teachers who are behind him.

This interviewee stated that, using this method of staff involvement, he has not had problems so far. However, he admitted, "that's not to say we won't, though, because we're losing teachers this year and next." As staff is reduced, "it gets closer to the bone; it's going to be tougher to be nice." The principal, as decline increases, is going to be seen as the enemy, he fears. The only factor that will off-set that kind of situation, he argued, was to ensure that principals remain part of the teacher bargaining unit. In his words,

> But, by golly, if the Ministry is foolish enough to take us out of the federation unit, they might as well close the schools--don't wait for the strike--because we'd have no credibility left either.

Teacher Surplus and Redundancy

It was pointed out in Chapter 2 that 37 of the 43 collective agreements for 1979-80 that we examined included clauses or memoranda of agreement related to declaring teachers surplus or redundant. Of the 37, however, only 11 had provisions which mentioned or even implied the need to protect school programs in surplus/redundancy decisions. By and large, a teacher's seniority is the major factor to be considered. There are differences, however, in the basis for determining seniority--e.g., years in the school system, years in the school, or years by program.

A fairly common pattern seems to be seniority first by school and then by school system. In one such situation, a principal said that he had an older school with senior teachers, while a newer school in the system has many junior people. As teachers from the older school are placed on the county's transfer list, they will be "bumping over in his school; the morale factor is bad." The group of principals hearing this comment agreed that this kind of situation was happening all over the province. Several principals expressed opinions in different interview sessions that surplus and redundancy was better handled at the system level rather than at the school level because there was a greater chance to have skilled persons in the various subject areas. Where "bumping" occurs by seniority within the school, the school may end up with less qualified (though more senior) people in some program areas.

Program impact is likely to be greater where seniority is based only upon years of teaching experience. One such situation is a "disaster", commented a principal who stands to have four of the nine English teachers bumped from his school. "Unquestionably, the quality of instruction will be affected" as he has to use teachers with other specialties to teach English. In contrast, a principal whose system defines seniority within areas of qualification, i.e. for major and minor, has had few problems. Teachers can be on only two seniority lists.

In another board, the agreement was that a teacher could be placed on the seniority list for every subject taught for three years out of the previous five, including subjects taught prior to 1978 and not included on the teaching certificate. Another principal, whose board had a similar clause, asked if the teachers were required to seek qualifications in that area. The "grandfather" clause seemed to eliminate that requirement. After last year, in fact, if a teacher went to summer school for further qualification, his or her seniority in the new qualification would just start at that time. This seems to be a disincentive for improving qualifications.

Bill 100, according to one principal, allows boards to negotiate away to the teachers many of the duties that were traditional property of management. The result, with current surplus and redundancy clauses, is that a principal must re-think how to organize the school because program must no longer be considered first, but rather seniority must be the first consideration. A principal in another group commented that the transference of power is what bothers him. "I think any principal practising in Ontario now knows pretty well that the power, as it presently exists, is in the hands of O.S.S.T.F...What I could do 15 or 20 years ago, I cannot do any longer."

A system that does consider school program in redundancy decisions was developed in one board and reads "as if it was drawn up by a Philadelphia lawyer." The principal explained that he first determines the numbers of classes and sections he needs in the timetable. He then takes the teacher with the highest seniority and assigns a timetable for that person. This continues through the seniority list until the principal runs out of either sections or teachers. At that point, he may declare a teacher surplus to the school (or request an extra teacher or half-time teacher) and the transfer process begins. The surplus list for the county is then put together. Those on "green" contracts (probationary) are released. Others on the list are transferred. The five who have the most seniority are placed in a pool, paid full salary for a year, and assigned to one of the five secondary schools in the county. The next year, those five move out of the pool (are "de-hired", as the Federation describes it), and the next five in terms of seniority move into the pool. It is possible in this system to hire probationary people to teach a program where those on permanent contract lack the qualifications, because the latter may be placed in the pool.

An interesting provision was described by one principal. The collective agreement in his board also allows for a supply pool of five permanent teachers who would otherwise be declared redundant. These are given a choice. They may be assigned to schools to teach on a supply basis or they may elect to receive equivalent money to use in retraining themselves.

In a board in which the secondary principal's group is quite strong, the principals reportedly release all teachers on probationary contracts and terminate whole groups by year of hiring. In this way, they actually terminate more positions than they need to. When they re-hire, they do so according to needs in a subject area rather than seniority per se.

A principal said that he has no probationary teachers--"They were wiped out with the initial cuts"---so the teachers he will lose this year have had at least nine years in the school and are all permanent contract people. Another principal who has also had serious staff cutbacks, a loss of 15 teachers in two years, explained that he was "getting down now to people with from 9 to 11 years' experience, very senior teachers, supposedly at their prime...You're playing with somebody you know pretty well." It is especially difficult for senior teachers to understand and accept, even when the agreement allows it, that a person with five or six years of experience can be declared redundant while someone with two years or less keeps his or her job because of subject area needs. Thus, while straight seniority decisions "are not fair to the kids at all", there are teacher morale problems when program has priority over seniority.

We heard of a couple of cases in which there had been an attempt to deal with transfers of surplus teachers across elementary and secondary panels within the board. In one case, a principal recalled that two or three years earlier the secondary teachers' federation had agreed to accept elementary teachers for transfer into secondary schools without loss of the seniority they had already earned. The elementary teachers, however, took the view that any secondary teacher transferring to the elementary panel would have to come in with no years of seniority. This led the secondary teachers to retract their stand, and now a teacher moving from one panel to the other loses all prior seniority. The principal argued that teacher surpluses caused by decline create fewer difficulties in the elementary panel where there are more women who move in and out and more flexibility in terms of inter-school transfer. It is more difficult for secondary teachers who, in his opinion, are more career-oriented and more specialized.

The situation in Metropolitan Toronto was described by one principal. At one point, there was an agreement among three of the Metro boards, Scarborough, Etobicoke, and East York. Since Scarborough was still increasing in student enrolment, surplus teachers from Etobicoke and East York were given the first chance for any job openings there. They have now lost the reciprocal agreement. In the elementary panel in Metro, a good many teachers were declared surplus in the previous year, but the board agreed to keep these teachers on salary. As a result, the board, in the current salary negotiations, came up "with a magnificent 1-1/2% salary offer, saying that the rest of the money will pay for these 109 teachers you wanted us to keep on...There is a hue and cry, of course, that it's not fair."

At the time our interviews were conducted, principals from two boards mentioned that the contracts had not yet been settled. The secondary teachers were on strike in one of these boards, and a principal said that they had been in negotiation all of the past year and had not met with the board for five weeks. One of the issues was that the board had no "surplus" policy in writing as part of the old collective agreement. Within three weeks of the time the interview was held, the principals had to decide which teachers would be surplus, with no agreed-to grounds for making those decisions. The federation's policy proposal "isn't worth more than the paper it's written on" because the board had not accepted it.

Timing was a factor of importance even where an agreed-to procedure had been followed. A principal explained,

> I can only emphasize the frustration that occurs in a school when you're told you have to lose staff after you've started a year. I've gone through that twice now, and it is probably the most agonizing kind of thing to try to reorganize a school timetable, where you're cutting bits and pieces and making arbitrary decisions on the basis of seniority. It really shoots down vital parts of the program you had planned.

A good many principals spoke about the impact of surplus-redundancy clauses on school staff in terms of teaching qualifications. One principal said he would lose his Art program because its teacher is a junior person to the school board, even though she had 21 years experience in Scotland before coming to Canada. Others spoke of the choice a principal must face either of putting an unqualified person in an area or of eliminating a program. The former is often the decision so that "subjects can stay alive." Several principals seemed to agree that "the happy days when you taught only your subject area are gone, and you have to accept the fact that you'll be teaching in at least two subject areas."

Core subjects are being affected more than special or optional subjects, argued one principal. The core subjects are in the larger departments which offer more sections. What tends to happen, according to the interviewee, is that senior people bump fully qualified, junior people and end up assigned to teach sections of English, Mathematics, or Science without being really qualified in those areas. Principals tend to think that "most teachers could cope with teaching a class of English, for example." The result is that:

> My English department is getting a whole conglomeration of bits and pieces of people from other departments, and they're not really qualified to do the job in English. So the department suffers.

Another principal agreed that schools are in the position of losing "that good solid core of teachers in the academic departments." Given the Government regulations which allow people to teach in the general studies area without special qualifications, the core areas are the easiest ones in which to move people who are surplus in another school. "You begin to lose your core of specialists, which I see as a very dangerous kind of thing for a jurisdiction." This situation is probably more common in systems where "bumping" occurs within a school before teachers are declared to be surplus. It is less likely, according to many interviewees, where declarations of school surplus are made and then transfers occur across the entire board.

A principal spoke for many when he said, "I think a lot of teachers in this province are going to be uncomfortable over the next few years teaching subjects strange to them." One principal likened the future to the past where teachers taught many subjects in which they had no expertise. He granted that they could not teach these subjects with the depth and competence that they are being taught now. Another viewed summer courses as "stop-gap" measures at best, which "don't really prepare teachers adequately." Such short-term retraining is going on now in the area of special education because of Regulation 704 and the new legislation that is proposed. "Where there is an area of real need and you have an opportunity to hire a hotshot specialist you'd give your eyeteeth for, it really hurts to have to use a generalist instead." The reference is to persons trained at a time when teachers used to qualify in two or even three subjects.

One principal reported that he was now receiving calls from parents who felt there is a real difference between the specialist teacher their child had last year and the generalist teacher the student had this year. Their desire to have their children in classes with specialist teachers may cause student transfers to other schools and accelerate decline in "sending" schools. Another problem occurs in schools in which decline is affecting smaller enrolment programs, such as Phase 1 (modified or occupations) programs. In these cases, a teacher who is very well qualifed for the program "starts looking around for a school where that program is secure; if a job opens up, he'll take it." Teacher loyalty to a school is replaced, under declining enrolments, with loyalty "to yourself, to getting yourself a secure job."

Other factors besides clauses in collective agreements affect teaching quality in certain programs. For example, we were told on several occasions that teacher retirements will affect technical programs all over the province in the very near future, at a time when these courses are in increasing demand. A good many technical teachers came into schools at about the same time, as a result of the Robarts Plan. The average age of these teachers is among the highest in teaching right now, we were told. Regardless of seniority agreements, a school cannot simply replace technical teachers with others on staff, and retraining is not easily done. One principal believes that new persons will have to be hired and given protected status. This would create serious morale problems as "you then have to move deeper and deeper seniority-wise into the academic staff." He believes the technical area is the one where "the most heat is going to occur related to the whole redundancy question." Another principal remarked that it would not be easy to hire new technical teachers under any circumstances because schools cannot compete with salaries in the private sector.

A teacher's sex was mentioned in one group interview as another factor to consider in surplus and redundancy decisions. One principal said that his school had always had men teachers for boys' Physical Education and women teachers for girls' Physical Education. Since the most senior teachers in his county are men, he may name a woman as Physical Education department head so that she will have protected status under the agreement. The same problems may arise in other areas such as Business programs. "The men teachers will be wanting to take the jobs of women who are more junior."

Several principals spoke of the problems associated with an "aging" staff, as surplus and redundancy decisions eliminate the newer teachers. One of the problems this will create is an attitudinal one, in the view of an interviewee who said, "As we age, we somehow lose our enthusiasm and become a little more apathetic and perhaps more cynical." Another principal opined that the more senior teachers are not as flexible as they once were, and they will be left in schools at a time when personnel flexibility will be very important. A second problem with having only senior staff is that these persons are not as willing or able to be involved with the extra-curricular program. A few principals had already seen an effect of this in reduced extra-curricular activities.

There are serious morale problems among more junior teachers, given the emphasis on seniority in job protection. A principal noted that there were 26 schools in his system, and the youngest teachers get bumped from school to school, with no guarantee of security. Such teachers, another person observed, end up teaching a variety of subjects in different schools, continually having to go back to summer school and realizing that they will still be junior in the next school. Some have to travel a considerable distance to accept a transfer. For example, the secondary schools in one board are some 45 miles apart; there is an extra inconvenience where teachers live in one area and teach in another. Even the younger teachers, according to a third principal, are saying, "Why should I work my --- off with extra-curricular activities or get totally involved, when you're going to have to let me go at the end of the year anyway?"

A principal posed the question of the development of leadership that will be needed in the schools in the late 1980's and the early 1990's. At the moment, he observed, there are few opportunities for persons who are not already in leadership roles, as administrative positions are decreasing. One of the few avenues that appears open in protecting jobs for young teachers is to appoint them to positions like that of department head, vice-principal, or principal, depending upon which positions are excluded from surplus procedures. One principal has a "rookie" vice-principal protected in this way and another has managed to keep the only instrumental music teacher in his school, another "rookie", by naming her as department head.

A continuing theme in this report is that factors such as collective agreements will impact differently on individual schools depending on the rate and extent of decline. While most of the comments that we received were from persons who have experienced or who anticipate negative impacts, one must be careful in generalizing this to all secondary schools in the province. As one principal wrote,

> We have a quite precise collective agreement to deal with surplus teachers in place and functioning. All sorts of horror stories are told about round pegs ending up in square holes throughout the process, but, by the end of it, very few actual atrocities remain.

The majority of principals, who have very sincere concerns, may only hope that he is right.

The Impact of Government Regulations and Priorities

Circular H.S.1, issued by the Ministry of Education under the authority of the Minister of Education, details the secondary school diploma requirements and is the secondary school principal's guidebook. As documented in Chapter 2, the requirements have undergone numerous changes during the decade of the 1970's, not only in terms of required subjects but also in terms of restrictions or recommendations related to school organization, curriculum development, and the like. As the 1980's decade proceeds, secondary school principals are also faced with the necessity of abiding by recent changes in legislation that impact on school program and staffing. Emerging priorities of the Government and its Ministry of Education foretell the need for further changes over the next several years.

This study's questionnaire for principals was mailed during the fall of 1979 and asked principals to describe how their school's program had been affected over recent years by Ministry of Education regulations. The responses, understandably, centred on the late 1970's change to compulsory subjects. During the interviews, however, principals were able to reflect upon the future as well as the past.

One of the major themes that emerged from the interviews was the perception of a growing emphasis upon centralization and uniformity, as opposed to the early 1970's emphasis on individualization of student program enhanced by locally developed curricula. The principals generally saw this move away from local school flexibility as evident not only in Ministry documents but also in actions taken by administrators and trustees and by teacher federations. This kind of perception was expressed by one principal in the following way:

> With declining enrolments, there needs to be greater flexibility for individual schools. Rather than considering the individual needs of a school, however, everything has to be done by formulas. There is increasing involvement of the Ministry in dictating what we must do. The teacher federations are doing the same thing. There is a problem of centralization when we need flexibility at the local school level... There needs to be a sensitivity on the part of people in administrative positions from principals on up to the Ministry.

In response, another principal in this group said, "Somewhere we have to sit down together--Ministry of Education, boards, schools--and decide to move to a consensus on where we're going."

In another interview group, a principal reflected that one of the things that has been difficult for schools over the last few years has been the constant change in H.S.1 , which he saw as an attempt "to keep everybody straight." He continued,

> Doggone it, you get angry sitting in your office thinking about all these people struggling for control. The Ministry feels things are getting a little out of whack here and there, and they suddenly want to get control. Senior officials see things getting a little out of whack, and they want to get control. It's like having 5 or 6 bosses and you don't know which way you're going. If schools could, by any stretch of the imagination, be run by the community--the principal and teachers and parents of that jurisdiction reporting only to a Director and the Board--that would be ideal. Each school community has a whole different set of values.

While we would not want to attribute this perception to a majority of principals across the province without further study, increasing centralization did appear to be a concern among the thirty principals whom we interviewed. This general theme was implicit in their discussions about a variety of issues related to the impact of Government and Ministry regulations, legislation and priorities. We will deal with this later in more detail.

The responses of principals to the questionnaire item about the effects of Ministry regulations over the past few years were coded into content categories for computer analysis. Most of the responses related to one of three effects of the shift to compulsory courses for secondary school graduation: lower enrolments in optional subjects, growth in core subjects, and an effect on difficulty levels (e.g. the need to offer required subjects at a variety of difficulty levels). The "other" category included a diversity of responses, including effects of new special education regulations, emphasis on "trades" courses, reduction in experimental courses and the like. Table 22 presents the analysis of responses by these categories.

Slightly less than one-fourth of the principals reported a negative effect of the new graduation requirements on optional courses. This factor appeared to be present in schools of all sizes, although it was reported with less frequency by the smallest and the largest schools. We suspect that the smallest schools would be relatively less affected because they have offered fewer options anyway, while the largest schools likely have enough students to maintain most options despite core requirements. However, the medium-small schools were the hardest hit in this way. Emphasis on enrolment in a large number of compulsory courses would create less than viable enrolments in optional subjects in these schools, where optional course enrolments are often marginally acceptable at the best of times.

The most common type of statement that principals made in response to our question was that core requirements had had little effect on school program since students had always been encouraged to enrol in core courses even when they were not required. Thus, only 13% of the principals reported a growth in core subjects as a result of the new regulations. Not unexpectedly, growth in core areas was indicated least frequently for small schools, where the human and physical resources have not allowed the school to expand much beyond the academic core areas. The largest percentage of principals noting a growth in core subjects were in medium-large schools.

TABLE 22

Effects of Ministry Regulations on School Program (1975-76 through 1979-80)

	Size of School				
Program Effect	Small	Medium Small	Medium Large	Large	Totals[1]
	N = 63	N = 92	N = 119	N = 38	N = 312
Options Suffer	11 (18%)	24 (26%)	27 (23%)	7 (18%)	69 (22%)
Growth in Core Subjects	3 (5%)	10 (11%)	22 (19%)	4 (11%)	39 (13%)
Difficulty Levels Affected	14 (22%)	20 (22%)	13 (11%)	4 (11%)	51 (16%)
Other	10 (16%)	10 (11%)	17 (16%)	8 (21%)	47 (15%)

Note: Percentages are rounded.

[1] Non-response and multiple responses account for column totals not equal to 100%.

The new regulations, however, have had an effect on small and medium-small schools with regard to difficulty levels. As Table 13 in Chapter 3 indicates, small schools have tended to concentrate their efforts upon general and advanced level programs. The same contextual factors that limit their programs to an academic core are those which prevent an expansion of that core to various levels of difficulty. The smaller schools, and especially the small isolated schools, seem to be caught between the need to comply with Ministry recommendations to offer required subjects at various difficulty levels and the fact that they lack both the teacher resources to do so and sufficient students to warrant the creation of separate programs by level. A not uncommon compromise, according to questionnaire comments, has been to reorganize the school's program into "open" or unphased courses, admission to which is open to basic, general and advanced level students. This practice allows principals to offer a breadth of program (i.e. greater variety in subject areas), but is generally a matter or expediency. Respondents note that the wide range of needs and abilities within subject areas cannot be met adequately in open level courses.

Some 15% of the principals mentioned other kinds of effects of government or Ministry legislation and regulations. It was clear, however, that most of these concerns relate to the future rather than to the past few years. In this section of the chapter, the comments and discussions of secondary school principals are organized into several topical areas. The subsections that follow focus, respectively, upon Circular H.S.1, legislation and regulations, and priorities for future directions in secondary education in the province.

Circular H.S.1

The Credit System. The interview comments made about the initial version of the credit system (i.e. the absence of compulsory subjects) reminded one investigator of the range of reactions expressed during 1972-73 as she studied the implementation of the new system (Ryan, 1974). While there was the same kind of negative reaction voiced by some principals, there was also a similar kind of positive reaction expressed by many others. The supporters of the credit system (or individualized system, as it was called in 1972) lamented abandonment of the system but took some blame for not facilitating its full understanding and acceptance across the province.

One principal had been one of the very first in the province to introduce the credit system voluntarily some 12 years before. He recalled,

> I'll tell you there was a happiness, a companionship, between the teachers and students. The thing that destroyed the credit system was a misunderstanding -- a lack of ability among teachers, principals, and the community to communicate. There's nothing wrong with the credit system...
>
> To say a kid could graduate with 27 credits taken only at Grade 9 and 10 levels, of course that was a falsehood. That's assuming the principal is a jerk who would allow that to go on. We always required 13 senior credits, even when the Ministry said we couldn't make demands of senior students...

Several principals seemed to agree that the Ministry of Education and the province's school principals should have "sold" the credit system before they instituted it. "They did the poorest job of communications that's ever been done", summarized one principal. One principal said that there are still parents who believe that, if their child fails one subject, he or she will have to repeat the entire grade. Because of a serious lack of understanding, the credit system reportedly has taken the blame for educational changes that had little to do with the system *per se*. If Grade 9 Latin ceased to exist, for example, the credit system was blamed rather than the societal (and university) de-emphasis on subjects such as Latin.

More seriously, the credit system was blamed for reduction in student skills in reading, spelling, grammar and mathematics. Interviewees argued that what parents and the public failed to understand was that these skills were affected directly by a completely different kind of experiment in education at the elementary level. Secondary schools began to institute the credit system at a time when elementary schools reportedly were beginning to allow students to spell words as sounded, to learn mathematics by "discovery" rather than by memorizing multiplication tables and the like, and to express themselves in writing without being graded on grammar and punctuation. One principal recalled that his school's first year on the credit system, for example, was also the first year that entering Grade 9 students generally could not spell correctly. The credit system took the blame anyway.

Even though many principals granted that there was room for serious thought about the time devoted to instruction in subjects such as English in the secondary program, they also viewed the return to a compulsory core as an "overreaction" to criticisms which do not refute the worth of the overall concept of the credit system. As one interviewee described it,

> To the Ministry of Education or the Board of Education, one telephone call was a serious matter; two calls was a disaster. The overreaction to the credit system was almost unbelievable. Because some parents don't understand it, the credit system has to be wrong -- all standards are falling apart; the sky is falling in.

The final blow to the credit system, argued a few principals, came because of the fears of teachers which increased as the advent of declining enrolments threatened job security. Teacher lobbies rose to pressure for their subject to be made compulsory. A principal recalled that Historians and Geographers lobbied successfully, so that now Physical Education teachers have taken up the strategy -- "for the sake of the nation, Physical Education should be compulsory." The interviewee argued that this was ridiculous. He asked what would happen if a student falls off a trampoline and breaks a leg, and it is a compulsory program. "Are the parents going to sue the school board or the Ministry? Should an epileptic be on the trampoline?"

The principal admitted that he was a bit "hyper" about teacher attitudes -- "Save us; make it compulsory, save us all." He said the province has already saved the English teacher for four years, the History teacher for one year, the Math teacher for two years, and the Geography and Science teachers for one year. Teachers of Physical Education, Industrial Arts, Music, Art and Commercial also want to be "saved" similarly.

> If you take this to its extreme, what we would end up doing is saving the teacher and not the student. If we keep going in this direction, we end up with a situation like that when I was in high school and the vast majority of kids left at the end of Grade 10 because there really wasn't anything more for them. It was the teachers' program; it wasn't for the kids.

This interviewee said that he has had a long-standing argument with his staff about maintaining programs like Family Studies and Man in Society and technical and business programs. "If you want to talk survival, you've got to talk about keeping those programs in the school because, without them, we won't keep the students."

The original version of the credit system, he said, showed which subjects were important to students. Contrary to popular opinion, students did not pick courses just because they were easy. (Indeed, several studies showed that students still tended to enrol in core subjects, although they might supplement core courses with high-interest, newly developed options). A principal concluded that students chose courses "because the teacher knew his business; he taught it effectively; they liked being in his classroom. They don't drop out of good teachers' classrooms."

The discussants in this group conceded that you could not equate a diploma that included optional credits in Latin, French, Physics, Algebra and Chemistry with one that included credits in options such as Man in Society, Family Studies, and the like. However, the student's transcript should have made such differences obvious. The problem was that the public failed to understand that the transcript was more important than the diploma.

Even now, the public does not understand that a student who has a Grade 12 diploma may have taken most (or all) of his or her courses at the basic level. Before the new required courses, furthermore, the student's program might well have consisted of a wide variety of courses with minimal requirements. Thus, one principal thought that the system had been "misleading" to the public. Today, it is very difficult for such students to meet the graduation requirements. On the positive side, the credit system had torn down the walls between technical, commercial and academic programs so that "no one knows who is a technical student anymore", a change the speaker saw as remarkable.

Principals in a couple of interview sessions spoke about the change, with the credit system, to providing graduation opportunities to "Occupations" students, those who used to be segregated in two-year programs in vocational schools. The principal of a junior vocational school said that, while his school is basically a vocational training school, his students have the opportunity of staying four years and graduating with an SSGD. "I guess we could be guilty of graduating students who can neither read not write." His school admits very few students who can read behond the Grade 5 level. Many of the students, he reported, are New Canadians who are not correctly placed in the school. "As soon as they grasp the language, we get them shifted into a more appropriate school."

When the Ministry expanded the graduation requirements to include two required credits in senior level English, the secondary schools had to expand Level 1 (Occupations, or in the new terminology, modified) courses to include senior English. According to one principal, "It is really not at the level at which the Ministry thought the kids would be graduating." This principal thought that making it possible for Occupations students to receive a high school diploma was a "great disservice done to the public." One of his peers totally disagreed. He argued that, even for university graduates, the student's transcript of courses was more important than the Bachelor of Arts degree.

In response to the remark that the man on the street does not know the difference, a third principal repeated the theme that "I think we haven't done the job if people don't realize the difference; I think that's our fault."

Lest we leave the impression that principals in general were, and still are, sold on the merits of the credit system, we shall report the emotion-charged reactions of two principals in an interview group. One of them called the Ministry's attitude towards attendance "indefensible." Attendance in class, or the lack thereof, is an "enormous educational problem which has been ignored." He believes the skipping of school or certain classes is inevitable with the credit system and its individualized timetables. He complained that attendance monitoring is an "administrative nightmare" in a school of 1,700 students on 1,700 different timetables involving 6 to 8 different teachers per pupil. The issue of student attendance, in his view, is "more important in terms of quality of instruction than tinkering with the system or program changes".

The students who present the greatest attendance problem, according to the two principals, are those in the under-16 group in Grades 9 and 10. One of the principals recalled his experience as a teacher:

> You have a class of 30 students. On Monday, 6 students are away. On Tuesday, 6 different students are out, and on Wednesday, 8 students are away, some of whom were away on Monday or Tuesday, some were away both days, and some are new ones. What continuity do these kids have? How many of these absences are legitimate? It depends on the devotion and toughness and tenacity of vice-principals and teachers to minimize that...
>
> It's difficult for people in the Ministry to translate that mundane thing into some kind of philosophical thing. But so many kids are falling by the wayside or getting a half-baked education, and so many teachers are getting frustrated trying to maintain continuity under very difficult conditions, under the credit system where attendance and skipping are real problems...You know you don't learn as much when you are absent as you do when you are present.

The other principal conceded that every organization scheme has both advantages and disadvantages. One of the significant disadvantages of the credit system was the individual timetables, making attendance checking very difficult. It was a simple matter to monitor attendance when 30 students moved as a group from class to class. His staff is considering offering optional subjects in packages. A student could choose one package. In this way, the Grade 9 students could be timetabled in groups. He was aware of schools in which group rather than individual timetabling was done, despite the credit system. "Those schools wouldn't give that up for all the tea in China." He concluded that, later in life, he would wonder if students who are in the individualized system "will ever get to know anyone very well"; and that is an important function of the school. While the credit system has strengths, this is one of the drawbacks in his opinion.

Another negative aspect of the credit system, in the eyes of these two principals, is its de-emphasis on competitiveness among students. One of them commented, "Competition is real; it exists; and kids and human beings are naturally competitive." He believes there is "nothing better" in a classroom than competition among students "to learn things, to get better marks, to do a better report, present a better seminar, run faster, jump higher, or whatever." The credit system, he argued, has undermined competitiveness because it has taken away the group. "When there is a group of students studying together day to day, there is competition." He admitted that, under the old system, the competition could also be of a disruptive form..."all the black leather jackets together in one class and they'd see who could be the most disruptive."

Definition of a Credit. Since the introduction of the credit system, a credit has been defined essentially as credit granted for successful completion of a course for which a minimum of 110 hours has been scheduled. When compulsory subjects were introduced in 1976-77, they were introduced as required credits. As noted earlier, this created organizational problems for schools such as Hillcrest High School which had instituted 60-minute periods and granted students .85 credit per completed course (see Ryan, in press).

Principals who were interviewed spoke of a criticism much more common than complaints about organizational problems. This concerned the absence, from the definition of a credit, of any requirement regarding student attendance. H.S.1 makes it very clear, said one principal, that you must schedule a minimum of 110 hours of instruction for a course, but at no time will student attendance form part of the decision as to whether the credit will be given.[1] Despite numerous calls to the Ministry regional office, he said that nobody had defined satisfactorily "whether we should be forcing students to attend class." His school has few problems with Grade 9 and 10 students, who are not allowed to have spare periods. Senior students, however, "always come to school, but they don't necessarily go to class." The principal is in a dilemma whether to encourage them to take the afternoon off and go to the library to do some heavy research or to ensure that they are in class every day.

One of the principals was from a board in which the secondary teachers had been on strike. The students had missed [illegible] weeks of school. He wondered whether they would really have earned their credits for that year. Another principal stated that, when teachers in his jurisdiction were on strike, the County Board took the view that it wasn't the students' fault so, unless it was an obvious case of failure, students were to receive a mark of 50 and be given a credit. Both agreed, however, that "The kids aren't fooled. They know they haven't got the background information they need to go on.

---

[1] While the definition of a credit does not refer to attendance, per se, an entire section of H.S.1, 1979-81 (p.22) is devoted to student achievement, attendance, and evaluation.

The Grade 13 kids know they'll be short-changed with scholarships."

Circular H.S.1 gives the principal the freedom to assess both the past experiences and past grades of his students for diploma purposes, contended one principal. Therefore, he argued that it is possible for a student to "shop around and get the best deal from whatever principal he wants to by saying "Here's what I've got; how much is it worth?" He had refused to grant a diploma to a Grade 13 student who left in April to enter a university program. The student claimed the university said the principal did not have the right to deny him a diploma. The principal told him to write the Ministry; in his view, the student had not completed the work.

The new priority for training and apprenticeship courses should be accompanied by evaluation of the definition of a credit and of credits required for high school graduation, in the view of one principal. He said that teachers across his jurisdiction agree that one cannot accomplish what the apprenticeship profiles expect in the time normally allocated by the school organization. For students oriented in this direction, he thought that the schools should look at alternatives such as "the packaging of the academic side of their program, which might mean a relaxation of the 110 hours' restriction."

He thought principals took H.S.1 too literally anyway, changing the entire organization so that periods would be 72 minutes long rather than 70 minutes long, for example. He thought the Ministry would allow schools to interpret H.S.1 - for example, to grant some Mathematics credit for work done in Machine Shop or Drafting. Another principal said that his vocational school had never offered Science until it became compulsory. They had had to introduce a Home Economics-type course called Science, which detracted from the practical program. In his view, the students could have used that time to take something much more valuable to them. Before principals decide that the Ministry is willing to let them "interpret" H.S.1 they should probably read Hillcrest High School's experience. (Ryan, in press)

Compulsory Subjects (Credits). As noted in the introduction to this section, the majority of principals stated that there had been little effect on school program because of the institution of required credits in Grade 9 and 10. The major effect, where this was noticeable, was a reduction in optional subjects at those grade levels and an increase in enrolments in subjects such as Science, History, and Geography. Almost all students enrolled in English and Mathematics anyway.

The History and Geography requirements were mentioned most often as leading to smaller enrolments in other subject areas. In one school, this meant a reduction in Languages and Music. In another, the principal wrote that the History and Geography requirements had caused them to eliminate four classes of Business subjects and to eliminate Grade 10 Geography courses and Grade 9 History courses. Another principal wrote that core program had taken away many students from Industrial Arts, Music, Family Studies and Business Practices.

Although all students must now earn one credit in History and one in Geography during Grades 9 and 10, the increase in enrolments in those courses seems to be temporary and, ultimately, the core requirements seem to damage the two programs. This issue was discussed by virtually every group of interviewees. Most schools decide to require one of the two subjects in Grade 9 and the other in Grade 10. Principals told us over and over that students finish these compulsory requirements and then move to other options in Grades 11 and 12. As one said, "We find traditional History and Geography are falling by the wayside, although Man in Society and other related courses are maintaining and becoming even more popular."

In reflecting upon the "serious losses" his school was experiencing in traditional Geography courses, a principal identified two related factors. One is the nature of the compulsory courses and the way in which they are structured. The other factor is that Geography is regarded by students as a "fairly intensive, academic kind of program." The latter has especially been the case in the last few years, he observed, as Geography teachers have been encouraged to upgrade their program by making the courses more structured and closer to a skills-development process. This makes it difficult for students to "opt in and out" of Geography at various grade levels. Since the courses have moved away from "a study of this country and this province" towards the theoretical, structured orientation, this interviewee understood why students turn to courses like Sociology, Man in Society, Marketing or Law. There is a proportional growth in enrolments in these areas at senior levels because students see them as being less academic and demanding.

Another principal posited that students see both History and Geography as advanced level courses "no matter how you label them." The Law course isn't seen that way by students, so a good many enrol in it. In his school, the Law course is taught by the Grade 12 History teacher and is "quite a demanding course." Because the teacher is a good teacher, the students stay even when it turns out not to be the "general level" course they thought it would be.

The decreasing student interest in History and Geography reflects a societal effect, according to one principal, who argued that in people's minds at least there are not jobs for people trained in those areas. There are potential job opportunities in Geology, but students don't identify Geography as closely related to that field. Even if students want to major in one of the two areas in university, the universities do not require a specialist program from Grade 13 for admission. Students in his school, he said, would not even enrol in an unphased Urban Geography course. A principal responded that "Maybe we should call it 'The World and Where It's At'...that would ensure three sections in the first year alone."

Several principals reported that the decision about which subject, History or Geography, to require in Grade 10 affected enrolments in Grade 11. That is, where History was required in Grade 10, students were more likely to elect a Grade 11 History course than a Grade 11 Geography course, and vice-versa. The senior level courses in each suffer because of the lack of continuity. In one school, History and Geography used to be offered in both Grades 9 and 10 for one-half credit in each subject each year, but this was discontinued because the British History taught in Grade 9 did not meet the Ministry's requirement for Canadian content. All in all, it appears that junior students are not electing one of these two subjects as an option at the time when they are taking the other subject as a requirement. Senior level courses suffer accordingly.

Some of the principals in one interview group disagreed that students were less interested in Geography because of a reported trend to more emphasis on intensive skill development. One thought that Geography skills weren't taught as well now as they were 10 years ago. He also noted that, in his school, the History textbook was better than the Geography text currently in use. Another principal said that he did not think the emphasis in Geography was the critical factor anyway. Rather he concluded that students do not see the course as relevant.

> Despite what people say about courses like World Religions, Man in Society, and People and Politics, these courses are relevant. We tend to underestimate the level of sophistication of many of our young people, who are not unaware of the fact that they are part of society...

> When you look at the course of study in the Guidelines for Man and Society and the like, there's a lot of really controversial things in there -- marriage, divorce, death -- things about man and society that kids are interested in at 16 years of age. Then tell them what you're going to study in Geography...
>
> The rural kids in this school tend to be more interested in Environmental Science (which is coded as Agriculture) than in Urban Geography, as the kids were in my previous school. Here, they identify with Agriculture because they go out and do their greenhouse stuff and slaughter a couple of sheep in the spring, etc. That takes away from Geography where it doesn't take away from History.

The required credits in English appeared to be welcomed by most principals. One effect expected by at least one principal was the probable disappearance of the English Studies credit. His school had introduced courses such as Modern Literature for students as a "kind of escape for the student who didn't maintain credits in the regular English program." However, now that English is required, there is a visible decline in requests for those substitute courses.

A few other subjects were mentioned as suffering from enrolment declines, but the declines were not necessarily linked to the institution of compulsory credits in other areas. For example, one principal said that Physical Education enrolments are "bad" in his school, with only about half of the entering Grade 9 students electing this. In other schools, enrolments are maintained because the school requires Grade 9 students to take Physical Education. Students also hesitate to enrol in Grade 13 Physics, according to another principal, if they have not taken Physics in Grade 11. This, however, reflected a discontinuity not due to SSGD requirements.

Speaking of the trend toward more and more compulsory courses, a principal predicted a pressure building up over the next few years from "trying to spread our resources too thinly." Options may be decreased in number even further. He thinks principals will reach the point where it might be "logistically impossible to schedule students into individualized timetables with so many courses compulsory; there will be too many conflicts."

Difficulty Levels. A few principals complained about the Ministry's emphasis on offering required courses at four levels of difficulty. For example, one principal wrote that the introduction of a Level 2 (basic) program had caused "many problems in a traditional, academic school." Another wrote that 40% of the students choose general level courses, "even if their ability is better."

The new Ministry terminology had created difficulties for a principal who tried to follow this by dropping the label, "Enriched level" and combining that into a single "Advanced" category. His school has always been a "highly academic school, with a reputation for preparing students for university." Part of the success of graduates of his school has been attributed to the Enriched program, which has not decreased in enrolment. When they called it "Advanced" this year, as the Ministry suggested in H.S.1, the students and parents did not understand that the work was still going to be more difficult but the credit would appear on the transcript simply as an Advanced credit, like those of students whose courses were less demanding. He said, "We're hoping the university people look at the course descriptions."

In nearly every interview group, there was some discussion of dissatisfaction with general level courses. One principal said that his school system now has a Task Force looking into the general level youngster. He observed that there is a "tendency for teachers to teach at a greater degree of difficulty in general level courses than what the course of study demands." He believes this tendency is province-wide, judging from the OSSTF study. He is going to introduce an experimental program this year, whereby 25 entering Grade 9 students who are poor achievers (but who do not qualify for basic level) will be taught for four periods -- English, Geography, History and Science -- by one teacher volunteer. They hope to improve the students' achievement by "looking into their social problems a bit more; the teacher will be a guidance counsellor as well as a teacher for them."

A second principal also is in a system that was sufficiently concerned to set up a similar Task Force. He believed, however, that there is no such thing as a "General Level Student", unless you can define what kind of student he is, what his needs are, where he is going, and then what kind of program is relevant. General level programs, he said, tend too often to be simply "watered-down" versions of the advanced program.

Some 65% of all course enrolments in his school are general level, according to a principal. Students are not going on to Grade 13 either, which he sees as a spin-off of the general level program as well as of the tendency for Grade 12 students to enter colleges (CAAT's), go into apprenticeships, or find a job. When the newest H.S.1 came out, his school eliminated all open level courses. Courses like Biology 301 became Biology 341 because he felt the open level courses "were really taught more at the advanced level than they were at the general level." This change, however, had an effect on programming.

Like the others in his group, he was concerned about the "whole process of standards at the general level." His school used to have a policy that if you got a mark of 40 in an advanced level course, you were given a general level credit, because there was supposedly a 10% differential between the two levels. He believes, however, that the differential is closer to 15%, "I think we hit the four-level (advanced) kids pretty hard, generally speaking; we're just heavy-handed with them." On the other hand, many teachers do not give homework to general level classes, claiming that the students won't do it. The principal views this as an insufficient reason.

> I think particularly the senior students in the general level programs will do their homework and eventually realize the value of it...The amount of homework that the kid does in Grade 1 to Grade 8 continues to amaze me. Then they suddenly get to Grade 9, and the general level teacher says 'What's the sense? They won't do it anyhow so I won't give it.' And so they go home without any books. It doesn't make sense. I think there's a difference in what the kids will do and what the teachers expect in terms of homework.

Advanced and general level students will often ask whether there is an examination in a course they are considering as an option, according to a principal, because they already have 5 or 6 exams to write. His school, to which he is new, has three sets of examinations a year, which he views as "over-kill." Teachers tell him that general level students do not study for exams any more than they study for tests, so he thinks it is a waste of time to set aside 5 or 6 days for each examination period.

An issue that seemed to be of concern to several principals was the attitude of community colleges to general level students. Many college admissions persons do not understand the difference between general and advanced level, according to some principals. They consider a 70% in Math 451 (Advanced) as the same as a 70% in Math 441 (General). The same is true for English. Student reaction is that, if you plan to enter a college, you have a better chance for admission by taking a general level course and getting a higher mark. Other principals thought the colleges reacted in a completely different way. For example, one principal argued that the colleges were established to provide post-secondary opportunities for general level students who did not take Grade 13 in high school, but he had observed that some colleges gave preference to advanced level graduates over general level ones.

Principals disagreed about the appropriateness of some colleges admitting Grade 13 graduates or even university graduates in preference to Grade 12 graduates. Many felt this was a violation of the mandate of the colleges (see discussion below). A few agreed with the view that "It is a . . . disgrace to be deemed effectively overqualified to go to college at the ripe old age of 19 or 20." This speaker thought that it was also a "disgrace" to give *preference* to such youngsters; his point was that they should not be discriminated against. There appeared to be regional differences among the colleges in their admissions procedures.

Several principals described a trend they see of more and more students being employed while still in school. One said there is a great deal of peer pressure to be a part-time worker, "and work comes ahead of school in many situations." Some students even leave school during the day to go to work, with parental approval. This kind of trend causes many students to elect general level courses so that there is less class work and more time to spend after school earning money. Most principals seemed to agree that students who enrol in general level courses are less motivated academically, so "if there's going to be a drop-out, it's going to be the general level student." This applied, said one principal, "no matter how much you want to pitch a program towards him."

Curriculum Guidelines. In Chapter 2, we documented the emphasis on local curriculum development during much of the 1970's and the shift back to more prescriptive guidelines from the Ministry by 1979-80. A few principals spoke about this and also about related issues. The principal of a secondary school in a large urban board said that his Board was "far ahead of the Ministry" in curriculum development.

Many of the guidelines developed by committees in his system "are really the models for the Ministry's new guidelines, in many cases." The Ministry's guidelines have tended to be very general and, in his view, "a bit impractical and hard to follow", so his board is now trying to write more "down-to-earth" guidelines for every subject. He also noted that most large school boards in Ontario are introducing their own testing program. This principal recognized that small boards probably "have much more difficulty providing this sort of thing."

His last comment was certainly demonstrated by the reaction of the principal of a small secondary school in a small board. Every change in H.S.1 and in guidelines, he said, means that teachers "have to get together and revise courses of study." He continued,

> We need a rest. We're fatigued. Some school boards are digging in their heels and saying, 'We will set priorities on what we will do, and we don't care what new programs you put in; we're not going to touch them'...Everything the Ministry does results in a Committee being formed that goes on for two or three years...
>
> I think this is especially true for smaller jurisdictions where we don't have consultants. We have classroom teachers working all kinds of hours at this kind of thing...Curriculum re-development and textbook appraisal have been added to the department head's role. I wince every time I get another memorandum, because it's more work for somebody.

Another principal pointed out that, every time there is a program change announced, the textbook also changes. "Grade 9 Science came in, for example, and that cost $3,600 for Grade 9 textbooks. Before you know it, you're absolutely broke." He says that he sets aside 18% of his total school budget for textbooks, but he "can't make do." When he had specialist teachers, he tried to "cut corners" by having them gather up material without textbooks. But, as generalist teachers are "filling in bits and pieces of the timetable (because of decline and teacher surplus provisions), they need a textbook."

Two groups mentioned their disagreement with the Ministry's timelines for introducing changes and the lack of teacher involvement in the changes. French instruction was an area of some concern, for example. Apparently French language textbooks are now listed in Circular 14 under required stages at which you move from one textbook to another. As one principal stated it, "They equate hours of exposure to language with skills, which is absurd, it's out of whack with reality." The result, he said was that they are using a textbook in Grade 9 "that we should be using in Grade 7, but it's illegal to use it in Grade 7." Another principal said that his French department head is "going around the bend because he has to phase out this book and phase in this book." The "phase-in" timeline mandated by the Ministry, he said, was mechanically impossible given the varied stages of the French students in his school. For example, the elementary teacher is supposed to use one book and complete it in half the hours the secondary teacher would normally take with that book.

When a change in direction was mandated by the Ministry for the study of Mathematics, one principal recalled that the province's Mathematics teachers complained about the direction, especially for general level students. Implementation was then postponed until the fall of 1982, and it will no longer be implemented in Grade 9 simultaneously with that in Grade 7. He hypothesized that the French teachers' lobby must not be as strong as that of the Mathematics' teachers. The least the Ministry could do, he argued, is to admit they were wrong in the date of implementation.

Legislation and Regulations

In discussing Government legislation and regulations other than

Circular H.S.1, principals spoke of program effects from the standpoint of school grants, regulations governing teacher qualifications, and teacher right to strike. Each of these is discussed below.

School Finance. The principals with whom we spoke almost never expressed the view that more money was the solution to all their problems. Indeed, there were only two areas in which principals saw an immediate need for fiscal reform. It is also worth noting that the principals who spoke about these needs do not necessarily think these are provincial problems. Although it may be Board fiscal reform that is needed, we assume Board allocations reflect provincial policies and grant formulas, to some extent at least. Thus, the points are made under this subsection.

An issue that raised concern among several principals was the need to replace equipment, especially in the technical and commercial programs. Rural areas of the province, one said, were late to take advantage of the Federal funds for technical equipment that were available in the late 1950's. In his system, he said that the normal grant structure for capital replacements was adequate "if you're talking about replacing the odd movie projector, but if you really need to go into a machine shop (in excess of $20,000) the money just isn't there."

One principal said that he was concerned about the amount of shop space that his school has and about the equipment being used, broken down, and repaired for general level students both in technical and commercial programs. His school currently is trying to "turn over all of its manual typewriters, for example, to electric." The total cost is estimated at $60,000 for the typewriters, in addition to the costs of wiring the classrooms. He thinks this has to be done "because I don't think businesses use manual typewriters anymore."

When you are talking about shops, he concluded that "you can just multiply that by some enormous figure." His school does not have enough shop space and equipment for the "amount of shop that the kids want to take." His students are beginning to request two double shops at the senior level (Grades 11 and 12). "They want auto mechanics, drafting, electricity, machine shop or something like that for four periods a day, and we're not able to give it to them."

In one interview group, a principal had suggested that most financial restrictions were coming at the local level, and in provincial grants. "Let's not be stupid about the fact that we don't have enough money to do what we want to do." Another principal responded that we must improvise, and the first principal commented, "It's pretty tough to improvise a gymnasium." Another added, "It's tough to improvise the maintenance of shops which are so terribly expensive to maintain." His school had been able to purchase one new lathe last year for $9,000. They had bought an "import" because the Canadian machine costs $12,000. This purchase is insufficient for the needs, however, "when you have one lathe in an occupations shop of 40 boys maximum." Another principal noted that the mandated shift to metrication had left his school with obsolete machinery, but the cost of changing these was exorbitant.

A principal from an urban area said that fewer students means less money for the schools all over the province. However, he argued that urban schools have more severe problems because "we have to pay so much ourselves, rather than getting grants from the province." He argued that places in Northern Ontario get almost 100% of their education costs from the province.[1]

---

[1] Northern Ontario Boards receive funding according to the Ministry's equalization grants and weighting factors, as do other boards.

The second issue related to student transportation costs. One group discussed statements that reportedly had been made by the Minister about the need to consider offering secondary programs by jurisdiction rather than by school. A principal recognized that he might be mistaken, but he thought there had been some changes in the last year or so in the financial structure, which took transportation out of one category and placed it into another, where "the rate of provincial support is much less -- a sly little move." Those two changes, if accurate, are in conflict. "If you want to share programs among schools within a jurisdiction", he argued, "you must have the money for student transportation to the other school." This situation might not be as big a problem for a totally urban board, but it would be for a rural board or a board with both rural and urban areas.[1]

At the school level, a principal said that his board no longer provides a special transportation grant in the school budget. As a result, his small rural school has to take transportation costs out of the supply budget. This is a big problem when teams must be taken long distances for athletic events, for example. Another principal observed that even the regular home-to-school transportation budget receives "a much lower rate of support from the province than it used to." If schools are going to bear more of a burden for regular transportation, "something else will have to suffer." He noted that the new special education legislation "will put a lot more heat on the costs at the local level", for example, as will increased local costs of preserving program as enrolment (and, thus, grants) decline. These provincial funding policies and program priorities seem to be somewhat conflicting.

A couple of other financial matters were mentioned by a few principals. One related to Government policy implemented through the

---

[1] These comments suggest that the regulations about transportation have not been effectively communicated.

Teachers' Superannuation Commission. Principals often spoke of early retirements of teachers as a partial solution to surplus staff with declining enrolments. A principal said that he had staff members who would like to "phase out" of education by dropping to half-time status at first and allowing their income to drop "nice and gradually" before full retirement. The Commission, however, would penalize these people because the pension is based on the salary during the last years. "If you have a half-year's salary, you're going to be hit." For this reason, the principal said:

> Teachers start looking at it and say, 'No way -- I can't afford to take a double penalty. I was going along, in effect, to try to help you out by alleviating your overstaffing. In turn, the Superannuation Commission is putting that in as my best seven years, and there goes my pension.'

He thought that the superannuation legislation needed to be examined in the light of providing incentives for early retirement of teachers.

Another principal commented that some boards are willing to pay retirement gratuities as a portion of the last year's salary, rather then after retirement, to influence the superannuation to which a teacher is entitled. However, the Commission reportedly will not permit this to be counted as part of the last year's salary for the purposes of calculating pension.

The researchers are unclear about the exact approval mechanisms for school construction, either now or in the past. However, we assume that the provincial ministry has some control over such decisions. It is perhaps worth noting that the principal of a secondary school whose enrolment will decline by 63% within a ten-year period observed that there were too many secondary schools in his area of the city. "The board, in retrospect, should not have built the last school which is about a mile from us." He named seven public secondary schools in the area. Further, a new separate high school has just been built one-half mile from his school and will "siphon off" a lot of his students, accelerating the rate of decline.

Teacher Qualifications. Many principals spoke of the recent loss of flexibility they once enjoyed to use non-specialist teachers to teach one or two classes in a subject area where specialist staff was insufficient to meet student requests. This concern, related to Regulation 704 (see Chapter 2), is more problematic given declining enrolments and the restrictions generated by clauses in collective agreements with teachers. Indeed, it is in the area of staffing problems that one encounters the most visible interactive effect of all three factors on school program.

An example of this multiple impact was provided by a principal who said that his French and technical programs were most affected. Because his school community includes a large group of French-speaking persons, the staff had been attempting to offer three levels of French (general, advanced, and enriched). The Ministry's regulation states now that a teacher must have French on the teaching certificate. This caused timetabling problems:

> We ran up against the problem of periods where we had to cover all of the French that was required with the staff we had, and we were told we couldn't have any more staff. We weren't allowed to bring someone else in from the English department who could teach a class of French, as we have done in the past.

Similarly, he had used a couple of Science teachers, who had some Engineering preparation, to teach a "class or two in the technical area to take some pressure off the regular instructor." He will no longer be allowed to do this.

The new regulations would not have been so troublesome in the past because "you could go out and hire someone." Currently, he is losing more people in the technical area than in any other, primarily because of retirements. Since the entire County's technical staff is "getting old", there are almost no opportunities to transfer technical teachers from other schools into his school. The result is that he has cancelled the Welding program for next year because there is no teacher. A part-time person is teaching the automotive program, which has been reduced from 12 periods to 6 periods. His school has "one more academic teacher than we need, but we can't trade that person to some other school for a technical person because they don't have one either."

A different kind of problem arises in the area of general studies. Under the regulations, a principal explained, any teacher is allowed to teach up to two courses in the general studies area. In his school, his Art teacher "has done such a super job that we now need 13 periods of Art taught." This teacher can take 6 or 7 of them, but the remainder must be taught, one or two at a time, by other staff members "who have no desire whatever to teach Art." According to that particular section of the regulations, the principal said, "these people are supposed to be able to teach all these things. Well, not only do they not want to, but I don't think they're capable."

There were different perceptions among principals of what constitutes evidence of qualifications to teach particular subjects. In the technical area, however, most agreed in complaining about the effect of the recent regulations on technical teachers who had been teaching for a long time. The effect of the stipulations regarding qualifications was described by one principal:

> The guy who is now teaching Machine Shop, and has been there teaching for 20 years and has done an excellent job, will be told he'll have to teach two-thirds for a two-thirds salary next year. The particular wood program will suffer. Summer courses are not as available (for upgrading qualifications). This is a really nasty situation.

Another principal, in a different interview group, raised the same issue. In his case, he has a teacher who has been teaching in the Occupations program for 12 years. The principal complained,

> All of a sudden, he is no longer qualified to teach Occupations because of a little thing that suddenly slid in this line -- 'Occupations are classified as Special Education.' If you are not a Special Education teacher, you cannot teach Occupations. This is a practical teacher. He has documents from the Ministry; his certificate says he is qualified to teach boys' practical subjects, technical trades...
>
> He hasn't done one thing differently this year than what he'll be doing in the future, except in the future he isn't qualified for doing what he's been doing. I have argued this at considerable length with the Regional Office and with Toronto, and they are not backing down one bit. They say if he wants to teach Occupations in September of 1981, he will take the Special Education course, Part I...[1]
>
> So I went to the people who were offering these courses and asked what they were going to teach so that my Occupations teacher would be a better Occupations teacher. (Their answer was) 'Oh well, basically, how to teach Special Education students in Grades 1 to 6.' I was very irate with them. I said, 'I suppose, at the end of the course, each of my technical teachers will be given a black hat and bag.' They did not appreciate that comment.

This emotional statement prompted another principal in the group to relate a similar case. He is also fighting the ruling. One of his teachers whose specialty is Auto Mechanics is to be assigned one class of Machine Shop next year. The teacher is two years away from retirement. "To say to this teacher you must go back to summer school to get the qualifications to teach this course, well, he's not interested." The Ministry might give a temporary approval for one year "if you twist their arm," but definitely it would not be fore more than two years. The principal has three technical teachers within five years of retirement. They get "quite upset" when told to go back to summer school so they can teach for the remaining years before retirement.

---

[1] This date has since been changed to September 1, 1985.

The principal of a technical high school in an urban area, in reaction to one of the above comments, observed that he fully supported the concept of having qualified teachers in the shops. "There's nothing worse than putting an unqualified person in a shop with all kinds of sophisticated machinery."

Another principal revealed that he had served on the Certification Board for a number of years. He said that the Board has had "a running battle" on these issues, especially with reference to Occupations program, but also with regard to other areas. The Board, he said, is aware that a person who has been teaching in the technical area for 15 years now might have to go back to get a teaching degree to teach a Grade 9 course that he or she has been teaching for years. This issue is an on-going point of contention among Board members, he said.

While the principals were aware that other subject areas would be affected by the revised regulations, the technical area caused most concern because of program needs and because of the difficulty of replacing existing staff. One school had been able to hire a young Auto teacher, we were told, but he resigned at Christmas time. The two or three persons who responded to an advertisement for the job "expressed absolutely no interest as soon as they found out about the terms of our contract -- seniority and the like." A person was hired from one of the local garages. The principal confessed that he was unsure whether the person "even received formal permission (from the Ministry)." He wants this person to return next fall, but he is unsure whether the Board will let him hire someone, whether the collective agreement will allow it, and whether the Ministry will grant a temporary letter of approval. He had made a request for a temporary letter of approval once, "and it was turned down flat."

According to our interviewee, it is difficult to attract young technical teachers to replace ones who are retiring, even when the collective agreement and the Board allow it. The local person who filled in temporarily for the school mentioned above informed the principal that, as owner of two local garages, he is paying more to the five-year apprentice he has now than he himself is paid for teaching school. By the time such people have the qualifications necessary to teach, this principal reasons, the starting salary is such that they would be better off working outside of education. He opened,"So, when the Minister talks of increasing the trades program, [she would recognize] it isn't going to happen. As soon as these fellows retire, we'll never get replacements."

For the past several years persons in teacher training have been encouraged to gain specialities, even in the academic area. The schools, one principal said, all wanted a specialist in History, a specialist in Geography, and the like. "We have put ourselves in the position we're in now, where we have specialists but we need academic generalists who can teach in two or three areas." Teachers now have certificates that are restricted to "one narrow band of expertise", and the regulations limit their teaching in other areas to only two classes. This creates "a real bind" with collective agreements and declining enrolments. Another principal said that he was forced to offer a full timetable of Music courses because the Music teacher, who has seniority, cannot teach anything else. At the same time, he has had to offer a junior technical teacher a two-thirds job "or nothing" despite the fact that there is a need to offer more technical courses.

A few principals expressed dissatisfaction with the upgrading process. We have already mentioned the limited type of program offered in Special Education, as one principal reported it. Another principal said that he has a teacher who took his university work in English in Quebec and did not have to take qualifying French courses "because he is so fluent in French." The teacher was willing to be assigned to teach some French courses. The principal reportedly was told by the Ministry that the teacher would have to obtain additional qualification, but admission to the course would only require the teacher to pass a written and an oral examination. But the universities, "wanting to protect professors' jobs", would not admit the teacher to the program until he had taken three or four of their French courses. He concluded, "What the Ministry puts down as the minimal requirement and what the university proceeds to do are quite different."

Another principal agreed that it was a major problem that the Ministry prescribes the guidelines in teacher training, but "you have 12 to 14 Faculties of Education, each responsible to their own Senate." He said there were marked differences in how faculties interpret and apply the Ministry's guidelines, "depending upon what people they need to take programs they wish to offer."

Teacher Strikes. Although no principal suggested that the Government withdraw the teachers' right to strike (in Bill 100), there were some interesting exchanges with regard to strikes. We have already mentioned the concern that principals expressed with regard to attendance not being a criterion for the granting for a credit, and the special concern for Grade 13 students who have missed several weeks of school because of a strike. A principal from one board said that the Grade 13 students in the semestered high school had lost over one-fourth of their program (the equivalent of 16 weeks), so he would not blame the Government for asking, "If a student can miss that much of the program and not suffer academically, why do we need Grade 13?"

Principals in one interview session asked about the experience of one of their colleagues whose teachers had been on strike earlier. In particular, they wanted advice about how to get the students "back to some degree of normalcy" as soon as possible. The response was an eye-opener to the researchers:

> The students were extremely good when they first came back. But there was real hatred for the teachers. The teachers weren't worth any points at all with the community or the students. I heard a lot of students say, 'O.K., don't expect a lot from us as far as attendance and work, because, if you can take off that way, then we're not going to do anything extra for you.' Of course that was short-sighted of them. But, for the rest of the year, morale was terrible, just awful...
>
> We had an assembly the first day back to try to allay this, and one of the kids spoke up and said he was very disappointed in the teachers; they weren't prepared to bend over and sacrifice at all; they were just 'money grabbers.'
>
> We tried to initiate programs and do things to get the teachers and kids together. But that seemed to open up a battle between teachers and students...
>
> We were caught on every side; there's no doubt about it. We sent newsletters home, apologizing and asking for help in getting the kids back to school. The vice-principal had a heck of a time with attendance afterwards. The kids said 'They don't care; why should we?'

The other major problem reported as resulting from the strike procedures of Bill 100 is the restriction that principals must remain in the school. The principal whose teachers were currently on strike said that he and the other principals had tried to make themselves available every day to attempt to maintain a good relationship with staff members. The other principal who had "lived through" an earlier strike replied that there was some resentment because they were still on salary and the teachers were only receiving strike pay. He said the resentment remained even though the principals voluntarily contributed $500 a month to the strike fund and, on balance, took less pay home than the strikers, many of whom took outside jobs.

Bill 100, another principal said, is responsible for creating the split between the principal and the staff when it comes to negotiations, and for the fact that principals still do not have full rights when it comes to certain sanctions such as strikes. The principals are concerned about what they perceive as a move to exclude them from the teachers' federation.

Current and Future Priorities

During the interviews, we asked principals to give their views on some of the newer priorities that appear to be implicit or explicit in Ministry documents or statements of the Minister of Education. One topic that drew a good deal of discussion was that of school-to-work programs, including apprenticeships, cooperative education, upgraded technical and commercial programs, and career counselling. A second emerging priority area discussed was that of special education. Finally, principals spoke of their concerns with regard to the ongoing priority of providing expanded educational opportunities for Ontario youth and the need for interface or articulation among various educational avenues. Each of these priority areas is discussed below.

School-to-Work Programs. In one group, it was observed that the Minister of Education was emphasizing the need to strengtnen school-to-work programs. This comment drew one rather cynical response that the Headmasters' Association had been presenting these problems to the Ministry for years, through their representatives on the H.S.1 Advisory Committee. Two weeks earlier, this speaker said, the Minister spoke to the Headmasters' meeting as if "Suddenly there was this new relevation." For years, industry has been hiring people from other countries to come here. He said that principals are more than willing to "open up programs that would involve apprenticeships and training for the future", but the problem he saw is with industry and the unions. Others spoke of lack of industries in the community and lack of money and staff for in-school parts of these programs. As we saw in Chapter 3, many schools have already managed to overcome such problems and have developed very effective work experience programs in a variety of ways (see Chapter 3, section on "Cooperation with other Organizations").

We heard several times that one of the problems with apprenticeship or Linkage programs in a small, rural community is the scarcity of places for the students. One of these principals said that, even when an apprenticeship is available, the timing doesn't "neatly correspond" to the in-school program. For example, a local machine shop owner had called him to advise him that there was an apprenticeship open that would start the next day.

> Then you're in a real bind. What do you do with the kid who says, 'You can either help me get into that apprenticeship or I'll quit school tomorrow to take it.' We have had to go on to advance the programs of independent study in order to try to accommodate some of these individual students, and that makes it really rough on teachers. So apprenticeship is not just an easy thing to get a kid into.

Another principal said that his school was located in a community where there are a lot of unskilled jobs available. A good many students drop out of school after Grade 9 or 10 to take these jobs. For them, he said, the dollars in their pocket now are more important than staying in school another few years and, "Then maybe, if you're lucky getting an apprenticeship, or, if you're not lucky, going out to compete with others who started a few years earlier." The educational planners, he reasoned, should be aware of changing economic factors that have led a "great many young people to come to school in the daytime and work the rest of the time, many 25-30 hours a week outside of school."

The introduction of cooperative education programs is causing some problems as principals see it. While a principal said he believed the program met some of the needs of getting young people into business and industry for training, the collective agreement has not recognized the extra burdens placed on supervising teachers and the rest of the staff. Unless extra staff and resources are supplied "you're asking teachers to take on an even greater load than they already have, especially in small schools."

The Ministry and the Board, he claimed, expect the principal to allow teachers to teach regular classes for half a timetable and then spend the other periods contacting companies, supervising students, etc. If you look at the staffing restrictions and the PTR, however, you realize that these outside periods "come out of the rest of your staff." The formulas in his board do not change just because a school has introduced a cooperative education program. He was asked to give a supervising teacher only the equivalent of one class period, but "I can't do it; he will have to take it on as an extra duty." He said this was unfair, since if a teacher is employed in a larger school, he or she would not have to do this as an extra part of work load.

The staffing problems described above were not encountered by another principal, who explained that the memorandum of agreement in his board allowed the system to hire one person to coordinate the cooperative education programs across the county the following year. After that, each school will have a half-time teacher to "get things going." In all, 2.5 new teaching positions will be designated for these programs.

A principal agreed with this point but added that they had found some companies unwilling to pay students in the program the suggested rate. They will only pay the minimum wage. Even though the Ontario Government Civil Service stepped in, he said some of his girls were only receiving $3 a day for the afternoon's work. "It's almost like slave labour. They seem to think they're doing us a favour by taking them." He also pointed out that many employers are "somewhat unwilling" to take students from vocational schools because they have limitations. When they have a choice, they select students from the schools with general and advanced levels, especially from the technical schools.

As noted, schools located in rural communities have greater difficulties in operating such programs. One such principal said that the local industry with a machine shop wants one student. The industry close to another school in his County wanted 75 students in machine trades. Although local opportunities are limited, the principal said his students were lucky to be only a few miles from a city, although they must compete with city students for placements. Another principal agreed, "If you're going to put kids in industry, the best thing is to put them in a city." His area is very rural, and he has no cooperative education program except as it applied in a limited way to students in the Occupations group.

Another disadvantage faced by smaller schools is in trying to provide the necessary in-school part of the program. We have already seen (Chapter 3) that many smaller schools do not have much beyond an academic program. The principal of one rural school said that the equipment his school does have is 13 or 14 years old and there are inadequate funds for repair or replacement, even if he could find a teacher (which he cannot). A neighbouring school in his County, he said, had also closed its welding shop because "the equipment was in such a poor state of repair."

Similar problems arise in the commercial area, both in terms of placing students in cooperative programs with local businesses and in terms of providing up-to-date equipment for school courses. Even in large schools, changing technologies have left the school equipment almost obsolete. In the near future, the entire business program in secondary schools may need to be revised, according to one principal:

> In the business fields, we have to keep a sharp eye out for things like word processors and minicomputers and the changing hardware and software that are being introduced at a pretty rapid rate even in small businesses and at a much faster rate in large businesses. That's going to bring some kind of change in the business program.

Even where secondary schools have good programs and adequate facilities to provide in-school preparation for employment, we were informed that social influences may deter students from availing themselves of these opportunities. One very clear example of this was provided by the principal of a junior vocational school. His school as a whole, he lamented, has never recovered from an image problem since the school started as an orphanage, then became a half-way house for girls recently released from training schools, and later given full status as a junior vocational school. The latter decision was accompanied with the intention that the school would provide graduates to serve the employment market. Two programs in particular, Power Sewing and Hospital Services, were designed and equipped to meet employment needs that are still present. However, because of the image problem, students are avoiding these courses. Their parents want them to be able to enter skilled trades. His school, he fears, is rapidly becoming "obsolete because we're no longer serving the employment market as well as we should perhaps." To replace these programs with others, however, would involve very costly plant changes.

Principals spoke of changes that are occurring in secondary school

Guidance. In earlier times, guidance counsellors "sat back and talked in generalities of the kinds of options open to students." A principal said that counsellors today must actively prepare to adopt the role of career counsellor, especially in "non-collegiate" schools. Counsellors are encouraged to go out, make contact with local industry, help students get jobs, and the like.

A principal said that, when the Minister makes announcements or encourages something, "my Board takes it as a directive." Thus, the Minister's views on career counselling had led to a total reorganization of the Guidance program in his County's secondary schools in the last year or two. Another principal said that, for about four years now, his school has offered a full-credit course in career counselling. It is an open course at the Grade 11 level, which is permitted within the Ministry's guidelines. He has not obtained the qualified staff for it, he confided, but his Guidance personnel are responsible for it. They call upon the community and other teachers to find out what is happening in the area.

Special Education. At the time when our interviews were conducted, Bill 82 had not been introduced into the Legislature. Thus, the principals did not speak in detail about mandated Special Education provisions. Nonetheless, they were quite aware that legislation was forthcoming which would be directed toward improving Special Education opportunities for students across the province.

The few principals who addressed this issue seemed to favour the establishment or designation of separate schools for these young people, rather than having each secondary school responsible for a program. The principal of a rural school admitted that Occupations students and others who should be in Special Education "are not being served very well." In his jurisdiction, many students spend 45 minutes on a bus to his school. He wanted the basic level students to transfer to another bus and travel an additional 20 miles to a school that can offer them a special program. However, the parents refuse to let their children travel further by bus, "so we're getting kids who haven't graduated from elementary school." To offer an adequate program, there would need to be a financial commitment with specialized teachers and all the problems that will bring, with staff numbers and re-training people in Special Education or hiring new staff.

Another principal said that his rural school was close to a city with two high schools that were established specifically for basic level students. Thus, he has resisted parental complaints about his school not offering courses at that level. "Our parents are learning that we can't offer this for 8 kids." Instead, they purchase student places from the city. He believes that such Occupational schools should be regional in nature, crossing school board boundaries. His Board would not be able to provide such a school, both because of student numbers and financial means. He estimates there would be no more than 150 such students in the entire County. Even though these two principals spoke of basic level, we assume they meant "modified" level, in Ministry nomenclature.

A principal agreed that there were insufficient programs available for Special Education students, but he thought that the academic student was "getting the short end of the stick" as more effort and money are expended in the area of Special Education. His County has no special school, such as a vocational school, for Special Education students, but he thinks "that's the way to do it." Such schools could have special grants. However, he said that nothing should be taken away from the regular schools, nor should the regular schools be expected (as his administration reportedly expects) to offer the complete range of programs. "If we're going to put an emphasis on Special Education, it had better be in an old-fashioned way -- with special schools."

We were told about special training programs of various kinds that were already being introduced in some schools. Several of these were described in Chapter 3, in the section on "Cooperation with Other Organizations." One such alternative program was described by a principal as a training program for a maximum of 20 boys who have either completed two years of Special Education or two years of a regular program. One of the major components is Basic Construction. The students spend 50% of their time in such practical courses in school and 50% usually outside the school. He is able to provide adequate staff because the program is considered to be Special Education and comes under that staffing formula. His school also has a second alternative learning program for socially maladjusted students, "largely because there are more of them in our part of the County than anywhere else." The young people in that program are there from two weeks to a whole year. They are sometimes "kicked out of their own homes and sent to the courthouse for three weeks." A principal from another board said that his school was cooperating with the Children's Aid Society in a trial program for problem youth who are wards of the Society. The Society pays for one qualified teacher and an assistant to work with these students.

From another part of the province, a principal spoke of the problem in his area with regard to children who were wards of the court. He said that there were three group homes in his area, which were really "a tie between the penal system and the child welfare system." Half of the children placed there by the courts, in his opinion, have little or no interest in school, and their attitude "rubs off on students with whom they associate freely." Unfortunately, he said, many of these students are in Special Education programs. The Special Education students "who are here to get an education and try to do better are very often adversely influenced" by these people. He said that the group homes will only accept students up to the age of 16. Since many have nowhere to go, the girls at least have learned that, if they get pregnant, they can go on Mother's allowance and Welfare. They also are eligible for money if they return to school, according to this informant. We heard similar cases from other areas of the province where there are such group homes for problem youth.

The establishment of such group homes, in lieu of reformatories, as one principal explained it, has placed enormous burdens on the secondary school. The vice-principal has to spend a disproportionate amount of his time counselling and working with these students, although he is not paid to do this. He has much less time to spend with the regular students. For boys, schools have been asked "to take over the functions of juvenile detention centres, and we're finding it very difficult to cope, because we don't have counsellors trained to deal with problems as severe as the ones we're getting."

An alternative trades program had been established in 1973 in one of the schools. The program now has 60 students who "could not cope with the regular school situation." Other schools can send students to the program for interview and possible admission. The principal reported that they have had "good academic success" with about one-third of the students, good "social success" with another third, "and we can't touch a third of the people involved in the program." He said the program is very individualized and, by agreement of the Ministry, "there is no such thing as keeping attendance records", although credit courses are offered. The school also has an Adjustment Program with a supernumerary teacher assigned to be in charge. Finally, they have a Learning Disabilities program for children of normal intelligence but whose performance varies from expectation.

Program Interface and Articulation. The Government of Ontario, through its various Ministries, has taken steps to provide a range of educational opportunities for young people and adults. Further, the Ministry has demonstrated an interest in, and a concern about, the interface between the secondary schools and the province's colleges and universities. Witness the funding of the Interface Studies and the move to integrate the Ministries of Education and of Colleges and Universities. The role of the secondary school has been changed, without formal statement, by changes in the system of dealing with problem youth. As we have seen, the new special education legislation and the desire to integrate these pupils in the mainstream, where possible, will create another modification in role definitions of educational agencies in Ontario, including the secondary schools.

Some of the principals whom we interviewed, however, expressed a continuing need for clearer functional differentiation where secondary schools, colleges and universities were concerned. In an earlier section, we noted the opinion of some principals that many of the colleges were not fulfilling their mandate because they were turning down general-level, Grade 12 graduates in favour of students who had taken advanced level courses and who had completed Grade 13. One principal replied facetiously that the colleges were doing the secondary schools a favour because more students were staying in Grade 13 in order to gain admission to the colleges.

More seriously, there was a concern that even universities are now "hungry for students" and will admit them before they complete Grade 13. One principal said that the Headmasters' Association had been arguing all along that the functions of the colleges and universities should be distinct as should be their admissions policies. Since both institutions are competing for the advanced level students, general level students reportedly are much more prone to drop out of school after Grade 10.

One principal pointed to the OSSTF study that found there were no significant advantages for these students in graduating from high school with a general level program, if their goal was to go to work. We have already noted the concern of principals with regard to the quality of general level courses and with the attitudes of students who choose these programs as an "easy way out." Nevertheless, it appears that most principals would agree with one who said that, twenty years ago, these students would all have dropped out of school. He believes it is much better for them to take courses they consider to be easier and to stay in school. Another principal said the secondary schools must share the blame if colleges will not admit these students, since even the principals admit that "they have not been getting homework, have not been challenged", and the like. "The solution is to improve the secondary programs and also to pressure colleges to live up to their mandate," he said. His concern for the general level students was shared by most of the principals interviewed during the course of the study. There was a strong consensus of opinion that general level programs were in need of a thorough revision in order to make them more responsive to the needs of the group of students with vastly differing potentialities who enrol in them.

Another kind of interface that concerned a few principals was that regarding alternative ways of earning credits toward graduation which might include night schools, summer schools, and correspondence courses. The principals were speaking here of full-time day students, not adults. One of them called night school a "big city opportunity." He is principal of his school's night school as well, and he said that students take a "million different courses for a million different reasons." Many students earn credits they need to graduate. Day-school students must have the consent of the principal to enrol in night school, so he says that he refuses "unless there is a compelling educational reason." [1] There are also remedial summer courses.

Anyone who teaches a credit course must be a qualified teacher, the principal said, but there is a difference in the quality of the program. Another principal agreed that the standards were different. Both believed that "the day they allow kids to start counting their summer school and night school credits toward Ontario scholarships, the number of Ontario Scholars will increase significantly." As well, they felt that the quality of the program was lower because the teachers often are inexperienced and because the course itself was shorter. One principal observed that, in his system, night school courses do not really meet the 110 hours for a credit. Both principals agreed that a person should be either a day-school or a night-school student, but not both. They concurred that the pressure of day-school students in night courses has "ruined night schools for the people for whom they were intended, that is, the true working adult." "How can teachers," they asked, "treat everybody equally if they must maintain day-school standards and still assist the person who has been out of school for ten years at the same time?"

---

[1] Consent is needed only when the student is enrolled for credit in the same course in day school (H.S.1, 1979-81, p. 17).

Almost no principals were positive towards correspondence courses. Again, one principal argued that these courses were intended for persons who could not attend a regular school program. Today, some students who are behind in a credit want to take a correspondence course. Others want such a course if it is not offered in the secondary school. Because the success rate is so low, however, at least some principals believed this should be discouraged. As some of them said, "It's a terrible way to earn a credit; it should be treated as a last resort." If correspondence courses are going to be seen as substitutes for regular courses in schools with declining enrolments it appears that some link with the school must be built into the process. Otherwise, only very highly motivated students likely will be able to benefit from this alternative.

In the subsection on teacher qualifications above, we noted the discrepancies that may exist between Ministry-defined minimal requirements and the requirements for admission to programs in the various Faculties of Education. Given the new Special Education legislation likely to be enacted, given the already mandated requirement of Special Education qualifications for teachers in Occupations and similar programs, given the need of secondary teachers to have multiple qualifications as enrolments decline, and given the trend within the Ministry to increasing the role of Faculties of Education in upgrading programs, it becomes imperative that the Ministry address this issue. The program and admissions policies of Faculties of Education in the 1980's probably cannot be left solely in the hands of university governing structures. This will be a sensitive area indeed.

Summary and Discussion

The impacts on secondary school program of declining enrolments were examined first in this chapter. Reduction of program is the major concern of principals since program breadth and depth is related to size of school. Already, 23% of the schools have experienced the elimination of some optional courses. Program reduction also takes the form of the combination of grade levels or difficulty levels within single classes (a practice referred to as "stacking"). The most extreme effect of declining enrolment is school closure.

Rideout (1977) has projected that there will be an overall decrease of from 18% to 20% in the province's secondary school population during the 1980's. Moreover, using probability theory, he predicts that the rate of decline might go as high as 40% for schools that are already small. Further, he predicts that up to 173 secondary schools (or 31% of the total) will have fewer than 400 students by the end of this decade.

The findings in our study certainly confirm the expectation that the rate of decline and the impact of decline will vary among the province's secondary schools. It is our hypothesis, however, that both rate and extent of impact may be greatest for medium-sized schools that will become small because of declining enrolments. These schools may lose the diversified program they have introduced to meet individual student needs, and they may have to move to the narrowly defined academic program that is characteristic of small high schools.

While most provincial secondary schools will face the need to reduce program as enrolments decline, the particular subject areas affected will vary. As we have seen in Chapter 3, student choice of courses is as important in affecting particular course enrolment declines as is the Ministry shift to compulsory courses. If principals and teachers allow student options to determine program reductions as school enrolment declines, many principals expect that traditional senior-level academic courses will give way to newer courses such as Man in Society, People and Politics, World Religions, and the like. It is clear that enrolment declines will affect Languages, Arts, Music, and Technical courses as well as senior level History and Geography. In terms of offering a choice of difficulty levels, the most common effect that is anticipated is a reduction in basic and modified level programs. There will likely be more and more "open" level courses, which are viewed as educationally undesirable by principals.

The chapter next examined the impacts on school program of collective agreements. Around one-fourth of principals surveyed reported that there has already been an effect on program of teacher workload restrictions. The percentage was higher for small schools, in which teachers apparently are becoming less willing than they were previously to carry heavier workloads. However, the schools that have already been hardest hit by all types of clauses--pupil-teacher ratio, workload, class size, and surplus and redundancy provisions--are the medium-sized schools.

Improved pupil-teacher ratios could help maintain staff and program as enrolments decline, but this obviously would cost more money. Many principals view central-office administrators as accountants and statisticians, rather than educators, when it comes to negotiating the pupil-teacher ratio. A few principals were especially concerned that they not be forced out of the teachers' federation because of the serious loss of credibility with teachers that would ensue, which would then affect their ability to gain teacher acceptance of curricular plans and assignments.

Negotiated class size maximums may force principals to eliminate small classes, since they are unable to increase the size of other classes as a balancing factor. We heard of a few instances in which school boards are trying to include minimum class sizes in the agreement, in retaliation for the mandated maximum sizes. Where class size limits of either kind are mandated, the result will be to reduce the number of senior level courses and basic level courses. Teacher workload limits are expected to have greater impacts on program than are class size limits, according to several principals. Workload limits not only affect the instructional program, but also supervision and the extracurricular program of the school. In summary, one principal expressed the feelings of many when he said, "Timetabling becomes a mathematical problem, not a human one. The result is loss of program flexibility."

Where seniority determines which teachers will remain in a school facing enrolment decline, the nature of the school program will be shaped to a large extent by their particular skills and qualifications. Only 11 of 47 agreements for 1979-80 mentioned program as a consideration in decisions about teacher surplus and redundancy, and often this was less than a specific criterion. Bumping procedures may result in the loss to a school of newer teachers with special qualifications. Indeed, the only way to protect new teachers is to name them as the head of a department, in systems where heads are protected from the surplus process. A good many principals said that they were already down to cutting fairly senior staff.

In the future, principals predict that more and more teachers will be teaching outside their area of specialization. The academic programs will suffer as more teachers teach "bits and pieces" of the program in academic departments. This situation will arise because the regulations allow staff to teach up to two courses in general studies areas outside their specialization. It is the "Anyone can teach a class of English" syndrome. A fear of many principals is that they will be faced with the choice of putting an unqualified teacher into an area or of cutting the area out of the school curriculum. As noted, principals expect the "most heat" to arise with regard to the technical area, as schools must hire new teachers to replace retiring teachers, and as the new regulations require teachers who have taught for many years to upgrade themselves with "proper" qualifications in the vocational area. The need for updating of qualifications will affect other areas of the program as well, and several principals complained that Ministry regulations and teacher education programs in universities are not always compatible. That is, the faculties of education may require far more than was intended by the new regulations, we were told.

Principals not only speak of the serious repercussions for younger teachers in general, but also for women teachers in particular, since women often have less seniority than do the men teachers. A good many principals spoke of the problems of an "aging" staff who, in their view, tend to be less flexible at a time when flexibility will be very important. Older teachers, we were told, are often less willing to assume extracurricular responsibilities. A few principals worry about future leadership as young teachers who are retained lose their zeal as they are bumped from school to school.

With reference to small schools, the trends toward negotiated conditions of work will cause special difficulties. Teachers in small schools, in the past, have always carried a workload that is typically heavier than average in the province as a whole. While such teachers have traditionally taught in areas outside their specialty, they may begin to be less cooperative than in the past. We did note, however, that the agreements from some of the small school boards still carry workload limits that are heavier than those of large boards in general. The principals of small schools will have to take steps to preserve the cooperation they have enjoyed in the past from teachers who prefer to assume an extra class rather than have further reductions in student programs.

The third section of this chapter examined the impact on school program of Government and Ministry regulations and priorities. Principals in their responses to our questionnaire were asked to describe how their school's program had been affected over the past several years by Ministry of Education changes in regulations. Most of the responses related to one of three effects of the shift to compulsory courses for secondary school graduation: lower enrolments in optional subjects, growth in core subjects, and an effect on difficulty levels (e.g. the need to offer required subjects at a variety of difficulty levels). Other effects included new special education regulations, emphasis on "trades" courses, reduction in experimental courses, and the like. A majority of schools reported no effect of the compulsory subject requirement, since their students had always taken these core courses anyway.

Slightly less than one-fourth of the principals reported a negative effect of the new requirements on optional courses. The medium-small schools were those most heavily affected both in terms of the loss of options and in terms of the subsequent growth of core subjects. Small and medium-small schools most often reported an effect on difficulty levels offered. As we have seen, the small schools have most often offered only two levels. They seem to be caught between the need to comply with Ministry recommendations to offer required subjects at a variety of difficulty levels and the fact that they lack both the teacher resources to do so and sufficient students to warrant the creation of separate programs by level. A not uncommon compromise, according to questionnaire comments, has been to reorganize the school's program into "open" or unphased courses, admission to which is open to all students. Respondents note that the wide range of needs and abilities within subject areas cannot be met adequately in open level courses, but they are increasing in number as a matter of expediency.

In the interview sessions with principals, we found many who still wished to praise the Ministry or to bury it because of the introduction of the credit system and the individualized student timetables. Many spoke of the poor job done both by the Ministry and by the principals themselves in communicating what the new system was about to the public and to teachers. We were left with the impression that those principals who were most supportive of the credit system and who had attempted to diversify their school programs will have the most difficulty in adapting to decline, as they will have to supervise the dismantling of some or much of their program, depending on the extent of program reduction required by smaller enrolments.

Principals often spoke about concerns they have with regard to student attendance, which many wish to blame on the introduction of individualized timetables and the corresponding difficulty in "keeping track" of students from class to class. Several complained about the absence of attendance in the Ministry's definition of a credit. For example, where Grade 13 students are attending a school with a two-month teacher strike, have they really earned a credit in each of their courses? A few principals opined that the definition of a credit should be revised in another way--namely, reduced for core subjects taken by students who wish to specialize in technical areas and wish to engage in apprenticeships or other work experience programs. Apparently, it is difficult to timetable students into these programs, given the time requirements of core academic courses. In one interview group, principals questioned the extent to which the Ministry is willing to let them "interpret" H.S.1 - for example, by giving partial credit in mathematics for a machine shop course.

Great dissatisfaction was expressed by many principals about the worth of general level courses. Some viewed them merely as "watered-down" versions of advanced level courses, which neither meet the needs of students nor allow for proper evaluation. While some principals argued that teachers tend to expect too much from general level students, others argued that teachers expect too little. Several persons argued that the community colleges are not abiding by their mandate, since they are giving advanced level students and Grade 13 graduates preference over students with an SSGD and those who have taken their courses at a general level. In summary, the general consensus seemed to be that there is much work needed in curricular and instructional development for general level courses.

One of the major themes that emerged from the interviews was the perception of a growing emphasis upon centralization and uniformity, as opposed to the early 1970's emphasis on individualization of student programs enhanced by locally developed curricula. The principals saw this move away from local school flexibility to be evident in Ministry documents, actions taken by school board administrators and trustees, and actions of teacher federations in negotiations. Several agreed that the principal could no longer express his philosophy of education, or that of the school community, in the program of the school.

Others spoke of the centralization and uniformity as coming from all directions at a time when local school flexibility was most needed. The move to more prescriptive guidelines for courses was unwelcome to principals in large systems that had invested heavily in curriculum development. The newer guidelines were also unwelcome to many small-school principals, who argued that every change of guideline requires the purchase of new textbooks and heavier workloads for teachers who must adapt their courses. As more and more generalist teachers are assigned to courses, some principals see that they will no longer be able to "cut corners" by having specialist teachers develop their own materials. The generalist teachers, or teachers teaching outside their subject area, will need good textbooks, and principals wonder how they will be able to purchase them. Small schools in small boards lack curriculum consultants who can engage in curriculum development. Thus, one is left with the impression that small-school principals may prefer even more detailed guidelines and materials from the provincial level.

Some principals are concerned about school finance and grants. Many schools need dollars to replace outmoded commercial and technical equipment; small schools need money to be able to mount such programs in general. Student transportation costs, we were told, would become especially important if schools are to share programs as enrolments decline. The new special education legislation will also impact on transportation costs, since most principals feel that regionally based programs will be needed in some areas of the province. There was an expressed need for the Government's superannuation policies to be changed to provide incentives for early retirement of teachers.

Finally, principals are concerned about the loss of their flexibility in deploying staff to cover program needs, given the new regulations regarding teacher qualifications. Staffing problems, they argue, provide the most visible interactive effect of decline, collective agreements, and Government regulations. They question the new priorities to increase trades programs and special education provisions, given the scarcity of qualified teachers in these areas. They are cynical about the possibility that retraining will be an easy task, given that the Ministry has no control over university admission policies and program provisions in faculties of education. Teachers, in some jurisdictions, they argue, will be reluctant to return for retraining and thus re-enter the teaching force at zero seniority.

During the interviews, we asked principals to give their views on some of the new priorities that appear to be implicit or explicit in Ministry documents or statements of the Minister of Education. One topic that drew a good deal of discussion was that of school-to-work programs, including apprenticeships, co-operative education, upgraded technical and commercial programs, and career counselling. Small schools in particular will have great difficulty in adapting program to these new priorities. They often lack the in-school component of such programs. As well, those located in rural areas have difficulty in finding places for young people in community businesses or industries. Even where such community places appear available, union rules sometimes restrict the use of students in many kinds of apprenticeships. Nevertheless, we were told about many innovative efforts to introduce such programs in various parts of the province. Where efforts have been successful, it appears that the board and federation have agreed to allow extra staff (above the PTR) or to allow the principal to provide the staff time needed for such programs. Supervising teachers require time outside the school, and this can increase workloads for other teachers.

While most principals recognize the need for improved offerings in the area of special education, small schools and those in rural areas will be very hard pressed to introduce such programs.One proposed solution was the establishment of regional schools for these purposes. A few principals spoke of the difficulties encountered in attempting to provide programs for youth who are placed in group homes, in response to the revised penal code for adolescents. While we were told of some successful programs, usually taking the form of an alternative school within the school, we were also told of situations that led principals to conclude that problem youth should not be the responsibility of public secondary schools.

The Ministry appears to have stressed the importance of interface and program articulation among schools, colleges, and universities. Yet many principals feel that there is no clearly defined and distinct purpose for any of the three types of institutions. Many are especially concerned about the variation that exists among the colleges in admission standards and policies. Others are concerned about the raiding of Grade 13 students by some universities. As already observed, many feel that the Ministry must step in to shape faculty of education programs and admission policies in response to the needs of Ontario education in the 1980's.

In conclusion, then, it is clear that the problems confronting secondary schools during the 1980's will not be solved easily. Secondary school organization will be affected by the interaction of decline, teacher-negotiated restrictions, and by societal expectations expressed in Ministry policy and regulations. If the organization and delivery of secondary school program remains static in basic format, the end result will be a reduction in the nature and kinds of educational opportunities offered to our young people. To offset this outcome, we must begin to identify and try out alternative ways of offering program. Much can be learned from the work done elsewhere in regard to increasing educational opportunities in small schools. The remainder of this report is devoted to a description and analysis of alternatives that should be considered.

References

Ontario Ministry of Education. Secondary School Diploma Requirements: Circular H.S.1, 1979-81. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Rideout, E. Brock; Murray, John S.; Sylvester, Christine; and Harris, Marion. Educational, Social, and Financial Implications to School Boards of Declining Enrolments. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1977.

Ryan, Doris W., and Greenfield, T. B. The Class Size Question. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975.

5 Program Organization in Other Jurisdictions

Chapter 5 presents a survey and discussion of program practices. from other jurisdictions. As well, it includes a case study in the form of a report made by an external review team to a northern Ontario school board following a review of its small, isolated secondary schools.

In previous chapters we have indicated that the major effect of external pressures upon schools was to curtail the program. In small schools, size was also curtailed. Consequently, our examination of this chapter of practices in other jurisdictions is primarily confined to documenting ways in which schools and systems have tried to increase program offerings. Furthermore, because the problems of program adequacy are centred more often in smaller rather than larger schools, much of the material in this chapter relates to small schools. However, many of the ideas seem capable of being adopted and adapted by larger schools. We elaborate upon this process in the discussion section of the chapter.

To gather the data from other jurisdictions, we used the resources of the Council of Ministers of Education to make contact with provincial curriculum coordinators or program superintendents from whom we requested information about secondary school programs. References in this chapter are to the various curriculum documents from which material is selected.

Approaches in Other Canadian Provinces

British Columbia. The large number of small secondary schools in British Columbia prompted the Ministry of Education there, in 1976, to commission a study of them. The results are reported in Schools and Their Communities: A Study of Educational Opportunities in Secondary

Schools in British Columbia (Johnston, 1976). This research found that the size of the school was not as important a factor in discriminating among secondary schools as were seven other differentiating dimensions which were proposed. These are: (1) Community/School Transience, (2) Utilization of Staff and Facilities, (3) Community Alienation from the Dominant Culture, (4) Specialized School Resources per Pupil, (5) Teacher Preparation Workload, (6) Community Economic Disadvantage, and (7) Opportunities for Specialization and Curriculum Choice. All seven dimensions, but especially the Community Disadvantage dimension, are related to university entrance.

Two other studies centred in School District #27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin) have been summarized by Handfield (1977). His report notes that "... teachers have a work load which includes multi-grade classes in subjects outside their specialty areas." As a result, the District has produced a series of specialized Curriculum Guides and Program Kits. The latter are so specific that they may be used by unqualified teachers. Yet, it is claimed that that use produces an educational experience for the student which is closer to the perceived policy of the Ministry of Education than might be the case if a course were being taught by a qualified teacher without recourse to the Kit.

The major difference between education received through using a kit and (teacher directed) correspondence courses is that the kits, which have been described as "teacher-proof", have a high hands-on component. At present, ten types of kits have been developed and cover, besides a Family Studies section, an Industrial Education component comprised of Arc Welding, Drafting, Gas Welding, Hand Tools, Heat Treatment, Sheet Metal, and Threading.

The same school district also investigated the use of mobile facilities, and although the concept was rejected because of the particular nature of the district, it was felt to have merit. A mobile Industrial Education shop, for example, would make it possible to cover a course more thoroughly and would permit more comprehensive training and skill development. It was also noted that "A mobile facility operated in conjunction with a community college would allow greater use of the unit, while cutting costs as well." (Storey, 1975.)

The British Columbia Ministry of Education's Correspondence Division provides courses to students, in all secondary schools, who need subjects which are not part of the school curriculum. As well, certain correspondence courses apply (solely) to small schools unable to offer regular options because of lack of facilities. Teachers, too, in many schools will need assistance as enrolments decline and they have to cope with multi-level or multi-grade classes, individualized instruction, etc., and the Ministry has been called upon to provide appropriate in-service training to assist such teachers (Schwartz, 1977).

Program funding requests have also been made to the Ministry but, as yet, no decision has been made on this matter.

Alberta. A recent study commissioned by the Alberta Education Planning and Research Branch (Collett, 1978) speaks indirectly to some of the issues raised by our research. Collett's study involved collecting information from 2,754 Grade XI students, a random sample of the total Grade XI provincial enrolment. With respect to program, Collett reports (1978, p. 126) that,

> In looking back, students' later views on course selection tended toward:
> (a) an increased recognition of the need to include Business, Vocational,Physical Education and other Practical Arts courses
> (b) seeing the "academic" courses as less important.

The report recommends (Collett, 1978, p. 137) that:

> Steps should be taken toward the provision of more and better practical work experiences, development of more

individual management skills, and preparation for the world of work.

Alberta Education's Junior and Senior High School Handbook 1980-1981 includes a section entitled, 'Special Circumstances', from which the two following quotations are taken (pp. 14,15). Although not all of the guidelines are applicable to Ontario schools, the quotations are included here as an example of an approach to a common program.

> Special Circumstances
>
> Note: This section replaces the one on "Small High Schools" which appeared in previous editions of this Handbook.
>
> The intent of provisions under this section is to enhance the learning opportunities for students whose programs may be restricted because they attend low enrolment high schools; or, in cases where the ratio of full-time teacher equivalents to grades is less than one. The provisions are not intended to be used as a substitute for sound program planning and timetabling procedures in regular high schools.
>
> Flexibility in scheduling of courses and in timetabling instruction may be facilitated by:
>
> -offering some courses which have variable credit value; for example, P.E. 10, Fine Arts
> -reducing, if necessary, the instructional time requirements from 25 hours per credit (see #3, p. 13)
> -alternating courses in sequential semesters
> -using correspondence courses to supplement the school program
> -offering not more than two sequent or alternate courses (e.g. Math. 10, 20; Math. 10,13) in the same period (double programming)
>
> NOTE: Double programming and reduction of the usual time allocation per credit will be approved only in exceptional circumstances. If consideration is to be given to these circumstances, it should be done only after the school board, or designated authority, is consulted.

The Alberta Correspondence School offers correspondence courses during the school year "to students who are enrolled in a high school but are unable to arrange for classroom instruction in certain high school subjects" (Handbook, p. 15). It also offers a special summer school program. This has been described by E.A. Torgenrud, Director of the Alberta Education Field Services Branch.[1]

> Correspondence courses designed for summer schools are the regular courses offered throughout the school year but are made available for a six week period during July and August.
>
> Residential summer schools as such do not exist. However, larger school systems offer summer schools during July and part of August in which a full year's work in one or two courses may be taken. The systems may permit non-resident students to attend for a supplemental fee from the resident system. Boarding allowances are available if non-resident students wished to attend. However, the number of non-resident students who participate is minimal.

Students who successfully complete a correspondence course receive a rebate of the fee.

The government makes capital grants available for the purchase of mobile units. These units operate in three different ways. Some offer only a six-week unit of work which is incorporated into a larger school-based program. Others remain on site for a whole semester. Still others remain at a school for the total ten-month year. In both the latter cases, the mobile unit offers a complete course.

Inasmuch as school offerings are directly affected by economics, Alberta Education has developed a special policy of making grants to schools which are either small or affected by declining enrolments. Of special interest are grants to small schools which are paid on the basis of the number of students and teachers, and a special grant to boards with a small assessment, such grants to be used as the boards see fit. Grants are also paid to boards "in lieu of the loss of revenue resulting from resident pupils attending an approved private school within the geographic boundaries of the board."[2]

---

[1] Personal correspondence, July 3, 1980.

[2] The quotation is taken from a mimeographed bulletin, How Education is Supported by the Government of Alberta, which outlines the type and amount of provincial support for basic education in 1979.

Work experience programs in both rural and urban secondary schools are an important part of the program. Technological delivery systems are still being designed. Cross instruction among systems is common. This is manifested by a tremendous number of transitional, transportation and boarding agreements. Discussion is currently underway with the Calgary and Edmonton boards to provide special services to other boards for a fee which will be reclaimable from grants. Exploration is being made of the use of community colleges to expand secondary school programs.

Saskatchewan.

> Problems associated with staffing and program delivery in schools with severely low enrolments are perhaps the most significant effect of enrolment decline.
> ...there is no single solution to the enrolment decline situation. It is perhaps fair to say that problems caused or aggravated by declining enrolments will not be solved by a single breakthrough but rather will be managed by taking a series of initiatives both locally and provincially (Melvin, 1979, p. 36).

The above quotation is taken from the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association Research Centre report, Implications of Declining Enrolment for Saskatchewan Education. The author summarizes current practices in schools and systems and suggests certain directions for the future. He notes and/or encourages:

(a) the sharing of services of administrative, consultative and support personnel between and among school divisions

(b) alternate year programming

(c) the use of programmed instruction and other individualized techniques

(d) the combining of schools into a multi-campus and the location of special subjects in one school with students being bussed to it or, alternatively, assigning a teacher who would move to various schools, thereby taking the program to the students

(e) the use of computers (and computer terminals), cable or satellite transmission of educational television and correspondence courses in order to broaden programs

(f) the personalization of correspondence courses through the use of conference calls, and audio-video cassettes

(g) the creation of modularized curricula

(h) the revision of the school year to a quarter system.

Melvin suggests (1979, p. 73) that,

> ...a quarter system might be used...to maintain and extend the range of educational opportunities. Within a quarter system a teacher might teach in three different schools during the year...Such a system might allow high school pupils to take a quarter of their school year in a residential setting but devote their time in such a setting to courses of study unavailable in their home school division.

He further adds (p. 74)

> ...new courses of study will need to be supported by rather large in-service education efforts aimed at assisting implementation and improving teachers' ability to practise their profession in increasingly complex educational settings.

Manitoba. Much of the research on program organization in Manitoba has been done by the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg.[1]

A summary of a Manitoba Seminar on Declining Enrolment held in April 1979 concluded (Husby and Riffel, 1979, p. 22) that

> The challenges relating to...programs and administrative arrangements as a result of current enrolment declines are probably best handled at the school system level because of the differential nature and effect of declining enrolments in different areas of the province.

---

[1] We acknowledge the kind assistance of M.P. Yakimishyn, Director of Research for the Manitoba Department of Education, in providing information related to our study.

The Department of Educational Administration at the University of Manitoba has published a series of research reports dealing with the impact of declining enrolments in Manitoba schools. One report (Benoit et al., 1976) which dealt specifically with alternatives, documented the following practices.

(a) sharing a curriculum development specialist among three school divisions

(b) rotating teachers among schools

(c) teaching courses in alternate years

(d) creating a multi-campus Vocational area. Four collegiates in four different jurisdictions operate as four composite high school units with each school offering general education courses and also one or more vocational courses unique to each school. Students wishing to take vocational subjects at other schools can do so. The organization of this program is in the hands of a special coordinator.[1]

(e) combining two campuses to make one school

(f) bussing students from smaller community schools to larger secondary schools for special subjects

(g) using correspondence courses when courses are not available in the school

(h) using the province's Correspondence Branch to provide lesson helps to teachers of new subjects

(i) assigning, for supervision, correspondence students within a school to a teacher whose subject is closest to the correspondence course taken.

---

[1] For further information about this cooperative effort see Benoit (1976, p. 42).

The report also contains a proposal for four 60' x 14' mobile units, one each for graphic arts, energy and power, home economics and electrical electronics. A teacher, permanently assigned to each unit, would travel with it according to its schedule.

Benoit et al. (1976) emphasize the necessity of holistic long-term planning in order that effective alternative programs not be curtailed because the necessary funds, used to establish the programs, were not provided for over a larger period of time.

The Maritime Provinces. Material in this section is drawn from one source, a Technical Report, No. 16, by Hughest et al. (1978), from the Atlantic Institute of Education. In common with the present study, Hughes (1978, p. 18) observes that the period of declining enrolments in the Maritimes "has also been a period of program expansion and diversification." The reason for this has been the increase in the number of course options. The example is cited of a Halifax high school with over 140 different course options. The report notes that once declining enrolment begins to affect significantly the level of funding, the consequences will be "some curtailment of the range of programs, and even some negative impact upon the quality of programs."

Some suggested strategies for program organization included the following:

(a) increasing the size of 'regular classes' in order to retain small enrolment specialist courses

(b) retaining courses simply because teachers are willing to assume an additional work load

(c) experimenting with alternative instructional procedures.

In this respect the report continues,

> There is considerable attention being given to correspondence courses, to package programs such as cassettes and film strips,

> and more "independent learning." Associated with this is the greater use of teacher aides in order to allow teachers to concentrate on purely instructional tasks.

The report notes a greater desire among administrators to hire teachers with multi-qualifications in terms of both subject matter and grade-level competencies. It further identifies a need for the knowledge of long-term funding arrangements, in order to plan wisely, and for financial support from the provincial government based upon factors other than student enrolment.

Newfoundland. The final report of the Task Force on Education (Crocker and Riggs, 1979) summarizes and expands upon information from several other reports commissioned by the Task Force. One of the concerns of the Task Force was that of examining ways in which breadth of program could be achieved. Consequently, its deliberations and recommendations are germaine, in many ways, to the Ontario setting. The following measures are proposed (Crocker and Riggs, 1979, p. 125).

(a) Simultaneous teaching of two courses in the same classroom where numbers are small

(b) block scheduling and alternative course offerings in small schools, so that not all courses are offered simultaneously.

A concern of the Task Force was that the level of service in school systems should, as much as possible, be made independent of enrolment. Some of its recommendations with respect to teacher allocations (e.g. more teachers to small schools) reflect this concern.

Small Secondary Schools: The American Context

In most of the literature reviewed, the "small" American school had an enrolment of less than 100. In this respect, the small schools were similar in size to those in Western Canada.

A major problem of small secondary schools is that of providing the basic program required for the students. For several authors, semestering seems to be the answer. Students are required to take continuous development courses sequentially. Trimestering and four-quarter years are also proposed.

A major problem of program in the small secondary school is the provision of courses suited to non-university bound students. In fact, several authors decried the lack of relevance of many school programs to the rural context in particular. Accordingly, a trend in small remote schools has been towards the development of work-experience, community-oriented programs. Although most remote areas offer few large-scale occupational opportunities, opportunities do seem to be available in places such as feed and seed stores, farm implement firms, service stations, fertilizer plants, offices, distribution agencies, and trades. In addition, several schools have developed student-run businesses to serve the local community.

Another approach to adapting the curriculum locally was reported by a group of schools in Maine. They pooled their resources, hired a full-time coordinator and developed an outdoor education site for use by all students and the community at large. An environmental studies program was integrated into the K-12 curriculum and curriculum units were developed.

In order to keep class sizes viable, many schools have opted for "open" courses, especially special-interest elective courses. Several schools have capitalized upon the special expertise of particular staff members or community members to offer arts and crafts and enrichment programs.

The problem of staffing small schools to provide a broad program is mentioned often in the literature. One solution emphasizes the importance of in-service training for teachers, facilitated either by a regional education centre or by close cooperation with the nearest universities and colleges. A second solution calls for the hiring of only multi-qualified teachers. Shaw (1978, p. 93) describes succinctly the problem of staffing in the face of declining enrolment.

> The central problem as staff members decline is that some will be hit very hard whilst others are relatively unscathed. The school must try to compensate for this by manipulating options and timetabling; but the extra constraint of keeping specialists decently busy and equalising the misery will have a distorting effect on curriculum intentions. Careful and longsighted staff recruitment, seeking out staff who can teach two subjects or will accept an integrated approach, and attention to the age structure of the staff so that natural wastage can help with reductions, will be more important than ever.

Instructional Materials

Small remote schools have two problems regarding instructional materials. To begin with, their district boards can rarely afford to purchase large quantities and a sufficient variety of current materials for each individual school. Secondly, because these schools are remote, sharing of resources among schools often becomes costly and time-consuming. The local community itself also may lack educational resources.

To combat these problems, many small schools have turned to modern communications technology for the answer. Hagerman, Idaho, for example, developed an "Exemplary Individualized Learning Centre" featuring tapes, videotapes, films, overhead projectors, books, microscopes, slides, programmed instructional materials, models, charts, globes and television equipment (Carnie, 1970). A school in Alaska has a totally individualized program consisting of programmed packages for self-instruction, and uses multi-qualifed teachers as resource persons

(McCarl, 1971). In fact, a major project of the Northwestern Regional Educational Laboratory is to develop these units, particularly in such specialty courses as welding, plastics, electronics, drafting, shorthand, advanced mathematics, science and speech (Heesacker, 1970). The Western States Small Schools Project developed a program of art instruction by amplified telephone, with visual supplements mailed to the schools. One school in Gunnison, Colorado, has even equipped its buses with headphones and tape decks, offering programs in academic subjects, AM radio, and news of school and community events (Heesacker, 1970).

For these schools, communications technology seems to have reduced the problems of small libraries, small staffs, and restricted programs. However, this approach relies on the initiative and self-discipline of the students and the flexibility of the teacher/resource staff.

Discussion

Three major conclusions may be drawn from this review of the literature.

1. All of the small schools studied emphasized the positive approach. They sought for ways to improve the quality of education offered while at the same time capitalizing upon the strengths of the small school.
2. The most successful programs seem to be those which result from ingenuity and imaginative thinking in the face of low enrolments and small budgets.
3. It follows that there is no single solution applicable to all small schools. Each school must tailor its approach to the resources available, the needs of the staff and the students, and the attitudes of the local community.

It seems obvious that small schools cannot offer the breadth of program that large schools do. There are fewer options and even the core program, which is usually quite academic in nature, is limited. In their attempts to expand or maintain their programs, small schools and schools in the throes of declining enrolment have that effort in common. Consequently, although the literature reviewed in this chapter tends to focus on the problems of small schools, the solutions seem generalizable to schools of all sizes.

The conclusions immediately preceding this discussion apply to the review of American literature, yet they are a good summary of the chapter as well. However, at the risk of duplicating their content, the following generalizations are made based upon the material included from each jurisdiction. The points below are expanded upon in succeeding paragraphs.

1. The difficulties facing small schools across the continent seem common to all those schools. These problems, which are reflected in program offerings, centre around the following factors.
    (a) organization of the school system as a whole
    (b) organization of programs within each school
    (c) modification of the existing program
    (d) use of human and instructional resources
2. The solutions to the problems listed above are arrived at, in part, through several courses of action.
    (a) ingenuity and creative thinking
    (b) wide-scale cooperation
    (c) appropriate use of technology

Problems

Four common problem areas have been identified in the survey of other jurisdictions. These are listed below, along with some of the measures being taken to solve them.

Organization of the School System as a Whole. In areas of small enrolments, there is usually reduced financial support for school programs and for instructional staff. Consequently, there is a trend to integrate the schools in a district more closely together. Organizational decisions made at the system level are used to facilitate the sharing of resources. For example, some school districts have semestered all their schools so that mobile facilities may be used in one area during the first semester and in another area during the second semester. In other areas, several schools have been organized to create a multi-campus complex. Block timetabling has been encouraged in order to permit students from one school to attend classes in another.

Also at the system level, cooperation between school districts has been noted in order to permit sharing of both human and physical resources. The essence of all such plans is to create a larger instructional unit than the single school.

Organization of Programs Within Each School. Many schools have devised similar procedures to organize their curricula. Semestering is often mentioned since it permits greater cooperation between schools as well as between schools and the community, and facilitates different types of teaching - learning methodologies such as multi-level or split-grade classes. Similarly, the procedure of creating open classes is in itself a commonly used technique.[1] The procedure of scheduling classes in

---

[1] It should be recalled that open classes are not looked upon favourably by the Ontario principals we interviewed during the course of this study.

240

alternate years is often mentioned. Use of paraprofessionals in order to free teachers (for instructional tasks only) is also cited.

Modification of Existing Programs. It has already been noted that it is fairly common practice to modify program content in such a way that several grades or levels of instruction may be taught in one class. Another popular way in which programs have been modified is to incorporate a work experience component into them. This practice, as well as making the course more relevant to post-secondary school employment, is also claimed to be effective in attracting and retaining students. This activity is paralleled by an effort, in some school districts, to increase the number of vocational-technical subjects offered, again for the same reasons noted above and for the further reason that many school administrators are convinced that even small schools should offer a wider range of courses than those usually conceived of as 'academic.'

Use of Human and Instructional Resources. The problem of how to best use human and instructional resources confronts most schools irrespective of their size. However, possibly because necessity is the mother of invention, many systems and schools with limited programs seem to have developed ways of using these resources to good advantage.

Where it has been possible to hire new staff, preference has been given to persons with qualifications in more than one field. For existing staff, a concerted effort has been made to provide a comprehensive program of in-service training. Where staff members have not been available in certain subject areas, courses, kits, and communication devices of various kinds have been used to provide instruction. As well, the resources of the community and region have been utilized. Sharing of staff and resources with other schools has also helped diversify the program.

Solutions

Although the discussion of problems has also included a survey of solutions, the three aspects of solutions noted earlier are worthy of further expansion.

Ingenuity and Creative Thinking. In all the jurisdictions reviewed as part of this study, the ability to think, plan, and act creatively seemed to be a major part of the answer to problems posed by small enrolments. Ingenious, creative school staffs and administrators seem able to deploy existing resources in ways that maximize the benefits to students. The unique, personal dimension of this aspect of the solution is very apparent.

Wide-scale Cooperation. There is also a personal dimension in the ability of individuals to initiate or accept participation in cooperative ventures. A structure or framework can be set up on a school or system basis in order to make cooperation possible. However, although ventures among schools and boards can be legitimized on paper, it is necessary to have follow-through on the part of individuals. Reports from other jurisdictions suggest that wide-scale cooperation is indeed possible and that it has improved the breadth and quality of programs in the schools and systems involved.

Appropriate Use of Technology. Every jurisdiction reported the use of some new technological device in extending school programs. Videotapes and two-way communication systems were frequently reported. Of special note are the kits in science, vocational and technical subjects, areas where small schools face great difficulty in offering a sufficient number of courses.

Conclusions

This survey of other jurisdictions has yielded sufficient information to suggest that some of the program problems of small or declining enrolments can be solved through teacher, school, and board cooperation with other teachers, schools and boards. The breadth of this cooperation, in turn, will depend to a large extent upon the personalities of those involved.

At the same time, matters can be facilitated by appropriate education policies at provincial and municipal levels. The creation of new technologies is expensive, and extensive cooperation between those levels has been a feature of the most successful plans.

A CASE STUDY

Introduction

During the course of this research, one of the principal investigators was a member of a team[1] who were invited by the Lake Superior Board of Education to review the program of its small secondary schools. After a visit of several days to the schools, the team prepared a report which was duly presented to the Board. At its June, 1980 meeting, the Board kindly gave permission for part of the report to be incorporated into this study. In the following edited version of that report, school names have been deleted, as have sections of the report not related directly to program.

Review of the Lake Superior Board of Education Secondary School

Background

Problems facing small secondary schools in Ontario are exacerbated in areas where great distances separate those schools. This is the situation in the Lake Superior Board where the three secondary schools are at least fifty miles apart. Enrolment in the schools is, in one school, 400; in the second school, 278; and, in the third school, 230. It might be easy to accept the inevitability of this situation with resignation, or even despair. However, it is to the credit of the Board and its Director that they have decided not only to examine their total secondary school organization themselves, but to open it

---

[1] The team was composed of

W.M. Morgan, Superintendent, Northwestern Ontario Region, Ministry of Education

W.W. Watt, Education Officer, Central Ontario Region, Ministry of Education

D.W. Eaton, Executive Assistant, Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation

J.E. Davis, Head, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Midwestern Centre to observation by an external review committee in order to secure data which may be used to effect improvements. This spirit of openness on the part of the Board seems to be reflected in its schools.

Methodology

Data for this report was secured by visits to each school where on-site observations were made and a series of interviews conducted with administrative and teaching staff, students, parents and representatives from the business community. In addition, each staff member was asked to respond to a brief questionnaire which solicited information about the teacher's perceptions both of positive features of the school program and also of those areas where improvements are required.

Contents of the Report

This report is composed of six sections: (a) Program, (b) Staffing, (c) Organization, (d) Enrolment, (e) Financing, and (f) Communication. (In the interest of brevity some of the recommendations have been omitted from this edited version.)

I PROGRAM

A major concern of the external review team and also of the questionnaire respondents was that agreement should be reached on a minimum core program for the basic, general, and advanced levels in each school. This program should not be limited exclusively or primarily by the provisions of Circular H.S.1. It should, however, be a major concern of the Board, occupying a position of priority in its deliberations.

Recommendation 1 *The Lake Superior Board of Education should publish a statement of its program objectives and, in some detail, outline for the community the purposes of its school system.*

Course Offerings Many of the students interviewed by members of the external team indicated that art, music and drama were major options which they would have liked to have seen offered in their schools. The absence of these subjects is also recognized by staff members as creating real gaps in the secondary school program. Other subjects, especially in the technical area, were also seen as desirable, but, on the whole, both students and staffs seemed to feel that when all factors were considered, the schools were offering a satisfactory range of programs.

The committee were impressed with the popularity and diversity of the technical and family studies courses at ______________ and noted the underuse of the family studies facility at ______________. They felt that the matter of enrichment versus diversity must be addressed at ______________ and wondered if, at all campuses, there was room for more unique, local course offerings. More general level courses with specific content seem necessary, as well as courses which speak to social issues such as Family Life, which relate to the school communities.

Programming at the Grade 13 level was cited by many teachers as a problem area. Issues related to a core program, additional offerings, and alternative organizational approaches should be addressed.

Recommendation 2 *A study should be made of the necessity of establishing a firm, basic core program at the Grade 13 level.*

The committee noted lack of clearly defined content and learning expectations in courses offered at the general level of difficulty - a circumstance prevalent in many schools throughout the province. Similarly, the "open" course, by admitting students with a wide range of ability, may create a number of different problems from those it attempts to answer.

At the Basic Level, the committee confirmed that there are few course offerings and practically none beyond Grade 10. Consequently, it was not surprising to find only small numbers of Basic level students identified in each school. Several teachers suggested that remediating the lack of courses might raise the student retention rate. To get a clearer picture of course offerings at the Basic level, the scope and range of Basic level courses at each school should be documented.

Clarification in specific terms should be sought from the Ministry about the qualifications needed by teachers of Basic level students with a view to providing the maximum amount of flexibility.

Recommendation 3 *The scope and range of Basic level course offerings at each school should be documented and compared with a view to establishing a core program at the Basic level.*

A partial solution to some course problems was noted in the ability of certain teachers to cope satisfactorily with the challenge of accommodating two levels of difficulty within the same class. Perhaps this methodology could be used more widely, thus obviating the need for so many "open" courses.

Regardless of the level of instruction, the provision of learning resources is a major task. Audio-visual equipment, library materials, and special equipment need to be considered as a total package which could be developed to enhance the learning environment within the system. The precedent, already set, of soliciting donations by industry of capital equipment, library materials, and machines should be considered for action.

Present A.V. equipment should be upgraded and a teacher-aide cum technician employed to keep it properly maintained. A central file of all learning resources should be developed in order that sharing may be facilitated. If upgrading costs of new equipment seem prohibitive, the use of refurbished, overhauled equipment might be a practical alternative. Expansion of resources by cooperating with the Separate School Board should be investigated, inasmuch as there are many precedents for this type of action. Continuing frequent use of the film services at the Thunder Bay Ministry of Education office should be encouraged and the potential of video-tape usage explored. In a world of rapidly expanding communication systems, use of new technology is recommended. The external committee found that the schools have already made their first purchase of microcomputers. (Students and staff were obviously enthusiastic about their use.) These and other types of computers offer an exciting variety of program options.

Recommendation 4 *Learning-resources needs of the system should be assessed accurately and, as part of this assessment, a central resource file should be developed in order to facilitate both usage sharing and upgrading.*

Several students told the external review team that they were enrolled in night school, summer school and correspondence courses. Undoubtedly these courses increase the number of curriculum options open to students. To the same end, the use of packaged course materials from other school systems, OECA's experimental Telidon service, and closed-circuit T.V. among the schools are other sources of curriculum materials which should be considered. A note of caution seems in order at this point. The use of other than regular classroom curricula and methodologies must be preceded by careful planning in order to integrate all innovative and supplementary courses with those of the regular program in order that students can plan a long-range total program rather than just take unrelated courses. Furthermore, communication with parents is necessary in order that they may fully understand the role of the "new" courses in their children's education.

Recommendation 5 *Contact should be made with the Director of the Ministry's Correspondence Education, and with the Director of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, in order to determine how the services provided by these organizations might be adapted to meeting the needs of the Board's secondary schools.*

Recommendation 6 *Administrative personnel from the secondary schools should be asked to make recommendations with regard to the integration of day-time, correspondence, evening and summer school courses.*

Work experience, cooperative education and linkage programs seem to be increasing in the secondary schools. They are viewed very favourably by students, staffs and by representatives of local business and industries in which the practical part of the program takes place. These types of programs seem to offer courses that are relevant to daily life, interesting, and hence potentially popular. Expansion such programs into various types of credit-producing courses should be considered, and the necessary liaison with employers and unions established to begin discussion in order to effect that expansion.

Recommendation 7 *The Director of Education should gather information from other small school boards in the areas of work experience and cooperative education with a view to revising both the in-school and the work-related components of the present program offerings.*

The committee noted that, apart from their formal programs, the schools also endeavoured to mount active co-curricular programs. Therefore, close liaison with community recreation centres could be potentially rewarding, with students having access to the full range of activities offered there. A volunteer program to provide assistance could be useful.

Field trips were cited by staff members as a desirable part of the co-curricular package. There are obvious limitations upon these because of high transportation costs, and the committee wondered whether there might be merit in bringing more attractions to the schools rather than subsidizing students to travel out of the community. On the other hand, since affluence was often cited as a major characteristic of the communities, perhaps students could pay a large share of most field-trip expenses with schools assuming the major responsibility of planning and coordinating the excursions. Here again a greater use of volunteers might provide some relief to the small numbers of staff members presently involved in this activity. The committee suggest that both the co-curricular and the extra-curricular events planned by each school should be re-examined to determine their nature, scope, impact, cost, and possible use of volunteers.

Recommendation 8 *Each school should establish a human resource data bank of community personnel, including teachers, who could be involved in both the curricular and co-curricular programs of the school. See also Recommendation 9.*

II STAFFING

The role of the teacher is most important. A poor teacher can break a program; a good teacher can expand program possibilities. In these rather isolated schools, some way should be found to attract and/or to train the unique specialist who is qualified to give instruction in more than one area, and especially in areas where there are presently gaps in the program. For example, a teacher qualified in English, Drama, and Music would be a valuable asset in any of the schools. A well-coordinated, long-range professional development program should be designed to help teachers broaden their experience and certification. Such a program could also facilitate the sharing of subject expertise on a system-wide basis. The merits and feasibility of both internal and external teacher exchange programs should also be considered.

Recommendation 9 *The Director of Education should establish a personal data sheet for each teacher, identifying personal strengths, professional qualifications, career interests and aspirations, and such other information as will facilitate provision of professional development opportunities.*

The external team suggests that serious consideration be given to establishing a regular courier system among the schools. Also, the feasibility of a system-wide internal phone system should be investigated. Follow-through on these suggestions would facilitate the sharing and transfer of information and resources and also help further the development of a sense of cooperation and unity within the system.

III ORGANIZATION

The external committee strongly recommends that a study be conducted to determine the feasibility of coordinating the organization of the school year in all the secondary schools. For example, if all schools were semestered, the sharing of resources and the transfer of students would be facilitated. There could be easier movement among the schools of persons designated as key teachers. It would permit the short-term secondment of teachers to become coordinators and it would help establish a concept of "system" among the schools in that it would permit a closer working relationship among them. Of course, other organizational patterns, such as trimestering would also facilitate the accomplishment of these objectives.

Recommendation 10 *Consideration should be given to coordinating the organization of the school year in all secondary schools operated by the board.*

IV ENROLMENT

Since the present enrolment statistics seem to be based upon straight line projections, there would seem to be an urgent need for a five-year projection based heavily upon business and industry input since the major employers strongly influence the population trends in the community. The data should be updated annually. It would also seem advantageous to determine retention rates in each subject area and in each school and, as well, try to determine factors responsible for these rates. In the same way, accurate drop-out rates should be compiled. Again, it is suggested that an exit interview be conducted with each drop-out in order to compile data on why students are leaving.

Recommendation 11 *Future enrolment statistics should be based heavily upon business and industry input.*

V FINANCING

The external review committee believes that schemes to maximize the resources already existing within the Lake Superior Board will, over the short run, be more successful and have a greater return than plans to secure alternative or additional large-scale funding. However, the concept of Ministry of Education funding on a minimum program basis should be pursued, since per pupil funding does not appear to provide a sufficient base for necessary programs in this jurisdiction. Officials in the Grants Policy Branch of the Ministry of Education should be contacted and a discussion arranged during which small school board financing problems could be reviewed. The committee recommends that intensive effort toward maximization of existing resources precede official representation to the Ministry of Education for major revision of funding formulae.

VI COMMUNICATION

Communication networks both within the school system and between the system and the community could be greatly improved. A first concern of the system should be the identification and development of human and material curriculum resources in both the school and the community. As an outgrowth of this action, the identification of support and resources within local business and industry should be made a priority. If the "movers" can be identified, their capabilities could be used to advantage within the system. Creation of advisory committees at both the board and school levels might provide a forum in which these movers might be of real assistance both to the educational system and to the community by addressing themselves to very real issues such as school and community limitations, sharing of resources, and even the task of fund-raising as another source of capital funds.

Conclusion

This report addresses itself to some of the issues raised by and with the external review team during its visit to the Secondary Schools of the Lake Superior Board of Education. Among these issues, several of paramount importance have emerged. The first concern is that of maximizing existing resources through system (instead of school) planning. Indeed, developing the concept of system is seen as a matter of overriding priority. Establishment of a courier system, a common school organization plan, short-term secondment of teachers to act as coordinators, and development of centralized resource banks and advisory committees are all designed to both develop the system and improve the learning environment for students. When internal resources have been fully organized and maximized, some effort should be made to investigate new funding and program arrangements to be directed specifically to the needs of small boards, and especially the small isolated boards of Northern Ontario. Ontario.

References

Alberta Education. *Junior and Senior High School Handbook*, 1980-1981. Edmonton, Alberta, 1980.

Benoit, R. *et al*. *Educational Alternatives for Rural Manitoba*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1976.

Carnie, George M. "Hagerman Finds an Answer." *Education Screen and Audiovisual Guide* 49, No. 2 (February, 1970): 14-15, 34.

Collett, Dave. *Curriculum Evaluation Project Executive Summary*. Edmonton: Alberta Education Planning and Research Branch, 1978.

Crocker, R.K., and Riggs, F.T. *Improving the Quality of Education: Challenge and Opportunity. Final Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Task Force on Education*. St. John's: Ministry of Education (Newfoundland and Labrador), 1979.

Handfield, D.W. *Rural Secondary Education: A Descriptive Summary*. A Report on the Rural Secondary Education Program in School District # 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin). Victoria: Ministry of Education (B.C.), 1977.

Heesacker, Frank L. "The Small School Can Be a Good School." *NASSP Bulletin* 54, No. 348 (October, 1970) 1-9.

Hughes, Andrew S. *et al*. *Actual and Projected Effects of Declining Enrolments Upon School Program Offerings in Selected School Districts in the Maritime Provinces*. Educational Research Series Technical Report No. 16. Halifax: Atlantic Institute of Education, 1978.

Husby, P.J., and Riffel, J.A. *Declining Enrolments in Manitoba's Public Schools: Issues and Information*. Winnipeg: Department of Education (Manitoba), 1979.

Johnston, J. Gilbert. *Schools and their Communities: A Study of Educational Opportunities in Secondary Schools in British Columbia*. Vancouver, B.C.: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1976.

Martin, Yvonne M. "An Analysis of an Experimental University Course Via Satellite." Unpublished paper, University of Victoria, 1980.

McCarl, Robert, ed. *Promising Practices in Small High Schools*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Library, 1971.

Melvin, Craig. *Implications of Declining Enrolment for Saskatchewan Education*. Regina, Sask: Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association Research Centre, 1979.

Ryan, Doris W. The Education of Adolescents in Remote Areas of Ontario. Toronto: The Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1976.

Shaw, Ken. "Managing the Curriculum in Contraction." In Power and the Curriculum: Issues in Curriculum Studies. Edited by Colin Richards. Duffield, England: Natterton Books, 1978.

Schwartz, Arthur M. Declining Enrolment: Implications for British Columbia's Public School System. Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1977.

Storey, Vernon J. Rural Secondary Education in School District 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin). Williams Lake, B.C.: Board of School Trustees-School District 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin), 1975.

6 Implications and Alternatives

Data collected for this study suggest that many factors underlie the difficulties in program organization faced by a large percentage of secondary schools today. Furthermore, because the genesis of these factors lies in several levels of government as well as in the system and school, solutions are not conceived easily. It seems safe to say, however, that the action which brings the most rapid and possibly the most satisfying results will be that taken by individual schools, groups of schools, and systems. At the same time, action taken by larger administrative units could have far-reaching effects, especially where matters of policy are concerned. In this section of our report, we suggest some strategies which may help to remedy the basic problem of providing program options and flexibility in schools with low and/or declining enrolments. These are grouped into three categories: (1) School-Originated Strategies, (2) System-Originated Strategies, and (3) Ministry of Education Assistance.

Although we recognize that program issues are closely interwoven with issues related to teacher redundancy, collective agreements, legislation and economics, we have tried, in this chapter, to confine our discussion to matters related directly to program.

School-Originated Strategies

Policy. To help guide the course of their program decisions, schools, as well as school systems, should formulate aims and objectives of a practical nature. These should specify the nature and extent of the programs to be offered at each level and take into account the realities of the human, physical and economic resources available. Without a statement of aims and objectives, programs may be organized in a haphazard way and not utilize effectively the resources that are already available.

Personnel. Where schools have the option of acquiring new staff members, they should endeavour to hire staff members who hold multi-qualifications. It would be helpful to have some staff members qualified in other than "core" areas, especially in small schools, so that those members could assist in the supervision of independent study courses. A regulated, updated file should be kept of teacher qualifications and interests.

Some secondary schools have used persons from the community to assist teachers in the classroom both by performing a variety of non-teaching tasks and by actually instructing students in mini-units of work. These mini-unit activities may take place in the school or in community facilities. Art, Music, Drama, Family Studies and some Technical units are examples of where community-based persons have assisted in instruction. Such assistance, for example, can help ease the teaching load in a class which is itself extra large because of the necessity of offering one that is correspondingly small in another core area. Also, the involvement of the community may heighten student interest in a subject area that might otherwise disappear because of low enrolment.

Community-Based Programs. As program options decline, many schools are considering the implementation of Co-operative Education, Work Experience, or Community Involvement programs. All three have proved themselves to be valuable in preparing students for the world of work. They provide on-site training in facilities that schools would be hard-pressed to duplicate and, as well, may help students gain a deeper appreciation of community life.

Because students can be placed in a variety of working experiences ranging through industrial, commercial, and social services, it is possible to greatly extend the range of the school curriculum. It has been our experience that schools who have opted for this type of program and have pursued it with vigor, have usually been able to locate sites for the community aspect of the program even in rather unlikely environments. A key factor seems to be the presence of an enthusiastic staff member.

School-Based Community Programs. Maintaining or increasing enrolment figures by attracting adult learners is a growing trend. A vigorous advertising campaign by two schools in our sample resulted in an adult enrolment of over 60 in one school and over 100 in another. The adults were enrolled in special classes such as typing and business practice or vocational classes. Night school classes for adults have had a long history but recently there has been a pronounced growth in evening credit classes for secondary school students. In some jurisdictions these credit classes are offered as a supplement to the regular day-time program and, according to a procedure outlined in H.S.1, students take them in preference to options offered during regular class time. Occasionally, a few classes are taught by community college instructors since there is no regular staff member available.

It seems imperative, in school systems where evening classes are used to supplement regular day-time classes, that a high degree of coordination exist between the night-school and day-school and that long-range plans be made and publicized so that students can plan their programs with full knowledge of all the options open to them. Under such circumstances, the evening school becomes a useful way to provide program diversity.

Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices. Correspondence courses are available to secondary school students in the senior division through the Ministry of Education's Correspondence Division. A wide variety of courses is available and many courses are currently being revised and updated. The major problem with correspondence education is that only a small percentage of day-school students successfully complete the courses.[1] The dropout rate is high. Schools intending to supplement their program offerings by using correspondence courses are strongly urged to institute a system whereby correspondence students are regularly supervised by teachers of similar or related subject matter. A useful supplement to the correspondence material is the large selection of films and tapes available from the Ministry's Regional Offices. The Ontario Educational Communications Authority has an enormous bank of resources which can be used to enliven the material provided by the Correspondence Division.

Other useful technology is looming on the horizon. Telidon and communication by satellite are two interesting developments which will be able to facilitate direct interaction between students in one setting and a teacher in another. Like correspondence courses and night-schools, however, best use is made of these facilities when their implementation is carefully planned and monitored. This includes the supervision of students studying through the use of these technological devices.

Experimental Courses. H.S.1 makes provision for experimental courses "to accommodate genuine local needs of a particular school or region that cannot be met by the adoption of a guideline course." The authors feel that this provision may have great potential for increasing program flexibility in many secondary schools.

---

[1] Official Ministry figures show a 15% completion rate.

Climate. It is perhaps impossible to legislate school climate. At the same time the general attitude of a school staff seems to be reflected in the quality and variety of program provided for the students. For example, teachers who volunteer to teach an extra class certainly contribute to the flexibility of the school program. Popular teachers attract students even to subjects which are usually considered not to be in demand. We call attention to these facts without making suggestions or recommendations.

System-Originated Strategies

Into the category of system-originated strategies we have placed procedures that involve cooperation both among schools and among systems. Also included are methods which are facilitated by a degree of central administration. The same sub-categories will be used as were used in the discussion of school-originated strategies.

Policy. Inasmuch as many individual schools have determined what shall be considered a minimal offering for each level of instruction, it seems important that a system take the initiative in this decision and set its own general objectives for different categories of students. This seems to be most important for students in the basic and modified levels and is also important in those systems where small enrolments at any level mean that the cost of offering courses at that level are proportionately higher than they are at other levels.

Systems should also create policies which are designed to promote program flexibility. Experiments in western provinces with multi-campus schools deserve close study to determine their appropriateness to the Ontario scene. We already have certain secondary schools which have been successfully twinned, so a multi-school concept seems a logical extension of the idea. Many secondary schools have a long history of making their facilities available to local elementary schools, especially in areas of Home Economics and Industrial Arts. Policies which encourage the movement of staff or students to participate in programs taught by qualified teachers in the elementary panel might help resolve program difficulties in the secondary schools in such areas as Music and Art.

In some school systems, policies have been developed to coordinate the organization of their secondary schools. Block timetabling in some or all schools permits the use of closed circuit television and also permits the use of two-way communication devices. Semestered schools permit the sharing of human and physical resources. Trimestered schools fulfill the same function. On the other hand, policies are sometimes needed to monitor a rapid move to semestering which has been made for no other reason than to attract students from non-semestered schools.

Above all, it is necessary to remember that policy is a discretionary guide for future action. In the area of program its purpose should be to create optimum conditions for schools to effect such program change as suits their particular needs. At the same time, the guidelines should be proactive rather than reactive in flavour so that they help set directions rather than merely confirm the status quo.

Of course, system regulations cannot be overlooked. Because staffing concerns are common to both schools and the system, this responsibility should be shared. The qualifications of teachers is a matter for special deliberation, and the system should be prepared to take the initiative in providing teachers with opportunities to upgrade and expand their professional qualifications.

Personnel. Although the system may have a special responsibility to establish guidelines for the hiring of teachers and for their allocation and professional development, it may also contribute toward greater program flexibility by hiring, or identifying, a group of teachers who are prepared to be mobile, and are willing to teach in more than one school. In urban areas, this may pose no special problem. In isolated areas, however, the availability of teachers who will either travel many miles a day between schools, or spend part of a week or even a whole semester in another community, is a real asset. Such teachers need the special consideration that emanates from a system rather than from the school level.

Community-Based Programs. Programs such as Co-operative Education, Work Experience, and Community Involvement may be generated at the school level. On the other hand, their support by central administration and the Board can help increase their scope and their general acceptance by the businesses and agencies who ultimately will be working with the students. Furthermore, support by the system for a program such as Co-operative Education is necessary in order to qualify for certain types of grants, such as those recently made available by the federal government for Co-operative Education. Certain benefits also seem to accrue when local employers feel they have an on-going, working relationship with their Board of Education.

School-Based Community Programs. We have mentioned that many schools have opened their day-time classes to adult learners and that some schools have vigorously advertised such classes. If adults are to become a more accepted part of the secondary school student population, they must feel welcome in all schools, rather than perceive that they are wanted only to stem the tide of declining enrolment in a few schools.

At the present time, the culture of secondary schools is predominately that of the adolescent, and the teaching methodology reflects that fact, resulting in teaching-learning situations in which adults may feel uncomfortable. Consequently, integrating large numbers of adults into regular classes of adolescents is not common. Adults-only classes are reported more frequently.

If adults are to become a more visible part of the secondary school picture, schools and systems must plan carefully in order to attract them, place them appropriately and meet their needs. It will not be enough to let this happen haphazardly or, like Topsy, "just grow." The designation of special classes or schools for adults (in multi-secondary school systems) may be a desirable procedure. For systems deciding to encourage adults to attend day-time classes, a vigorous personal advertising scheme seems to achieve better results than the procedure of placing a general advertisement in the paper and hoping that something will happen.

Evening schools and summer schools can offer programs which extend the range of subjects open to students. At the same time, they seem more open (evening schools especially) to adult students.

We have already stressed the necessity of coordination of these programs with those of the day schools. Coordination is often done best at the system level, involving all the schools concerned; it is seen as essential when the programs offered in the evenings or during the summer are considered as extensions of the day-time programs rather than as separate entities.

Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices. Although the use of correspondence courses after Grade 11 is largely a matter to be decided at the school level,it is feasible that support for students taking such courses could be coordinated centrally. This might most profitably be accomplished through allowing released time for teachers to supervise correspondence students, or through the provision, centrally, of additional resources, such as print and audio-visual materials. It would seem necessary that small schools have better-than-average library facilities, especially in settings where numbers of students are enrolled in correspondence courses. Allocation of funds in order to ensure such facilities should be the concern of local Boards.

Modern technology is making other types of learning methods possible. Certain packaged courses are already available for individualized computer instruction. Through requests made directly to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, boards may obtain assistance in maintaining program flexibility.

One of the most promising methods of providing that flexibility may be through the use of packaged curriculums. These have already been referred to in our discussion of practices in other jurisdictions. The work of the Northwestern Regional Laboratory in the United States and the local efforts of the Cariboo-Chilcoten Board in British Columbia may be examined as prototypes of what might be done in Ontario. One of the special merits of such courses is that many of them have been developed for technical-vocational subjects, an area of study which is often weak in schools with low enrolments.

We see potential in these courses in at least three ways. They could be used generally to expand a school program; they could also be a valuable supplement to already available correspondence courses, and they could be source material for related courses. Obtaining and assessing the value of packaged courses should be the concern of a system rather than of an individual school. A recommendation of the designers of special packaged courses is that local teachers be involved in their preparation and/or adaptation. Again, coordination of the teams of teachers necessary for this should be a central board function. In a similar fashion, the system (albeit in cooperation with the Ministry of Education) should assume responsibility for investigating the potential contribution of other technological devices such as Telidon (two-way television) conference phone hook-ups and correspondence by satellite. Naturally, we would expect that any move to use different materials would be preceded by thorough discussion and marked by careful coordination.

Experimental Courses. Courses referred to in the previous section may be courses developed from Ministry guidelines. On the other hand, they may be designated as experimental courses. Most such courses will likely be developed at the school level, but it seems reasonable to assume that some experimental courses might be designed at the system level, possibly in response to and in consultation with the local community. Thus, in areas dominated by a major employer, such as a mine or mill, it would seem eminently reasonable to have courses related to that industry in the curriculum. Such courses could deal with production safety, marketing, etc., as well as with skills that might be directly transferable to the work site.

Climate. We have not made suggestions or recommendations about school climate. Neither do we do so about system climate. We simply observe that teachers do develop a type of mental set towards their employers. Questionnaire returns mentioned the nebulous "they", the system, and indicated various degrees of empathy, apathy or antagonism towards it. School systems can take neither full blame nor praise for the attitudes their employees have towards them. Personal factors and attitudes towards the schools, community, the Ministry and life in general mediate an individual teacher's attitude towards the system. Nevertheless, and at the risk of sounding unduly trite, we observe that system decisions that have a direct impact upon employees should be made only after a serious consideration of the consequences of such actions.

Ministry of Education Assistance

At the time that this report was being completed (September, 1980) the Ministry of Education had a special task force investigating secondary school education in Ontario. That task force, because of its size and the resources available to it, will be able to make a far more exhaustive study than could the principal investigators of the present research. However, inasmuch as this study may become part of the input to the task force, we offer the following points for consideration.

Policy. As the number of regulations and amount of legislation directly affecting program organization in the secondary school increases, the general effect is to decrease the program flexibility in larger secondary schools and limit the number of options in smaller schools. This of course is to be expected, for as more and more courses become mandatory, teachers must spend an increased amount of time on mandatory courses and, consequently, less time on optional courses. Since courses are to be offered at several levels of difficulty, small schools especially are faced with an impossible situation which can be met only by creating open level courses, or by combining levels in one classroom. Even so, it is often impossible to mount more than one or two successful courses at the basic level. In many jurisdictions, schools can combine their resources in order to meet a wider range of student needs than could be met by any one school. However, in more isolated areas, this is just not possible. The stark fact is that the smaller the school and the more isolated it is, the less the probability exists for equality of educational opportunity for the students. Those students who can profit from a basically core program will manage satisfactorily. Those students who want occupations, technical-vocational or aesthetic courses will be short-changed.

Personnel. Since the greater part of educational expenditure is for personnel, the Ministry of Education should consider matching its mandatory courses with grants to ensure sufficient staff to teach those courses. In larger schools, this policy would have minimal impact, but in smaller schools this type of program funding would allow a significantly greater diversity of program. It still would not achieve the goal of equality of educational opportunity, but it would go a long way towards ensuring that schools could meet the minimum program requirements set by the Ministry.

Community-Based Programs. The Ministry of Education has officially endorsed Co-operative Education programs of many types. However, the value of co-op courses does not seem to be fully realized by many schools. Other schools, although realizing the value of the program, experience great difficulty in actually organizing it. We suggest that the Ministry move a step beyond permitting co-operative education courses to providing active support and assistance to schools for launching such courses. To this end, making available the services of Education Officers from the Regional offices should be considered. In order for these persons to do the job well, special training will undoubtedly be necessary. Knowledge of the experience of school systems already heavily involved in co-operative education schemes would be valuable to those persons.

School-Based Community Programs. Because of its knowledge of school-based community programs across the province, the Ministry of Education should be in a position to offer sound advice to schools and school systems who wish to launch programs to attract adults into the schools, or who wish to extend their programs by offering a variety of evening and summer courses. We recommend that the Ministry set up a file of school-based community programs which would include information about the type of programs offered, the methods by which a program was advertised, and details of course enrolment, program evaluation, and so on. Such a file should be open to other interested schools and Boards.

Correspondence Courses and Use of Technological Devices. It is in the area of correspondence courses and the use of technology that we feel that the Ministry should be able to make a significant impact upon secondary school programs. A major reason why this should be so is that the Correspondence Education Branch and the Ontario Educational Communications Authority are both part of the Ministry's central operation. We suggest that schools in which students take correspondence courses should be asked to suggest ways in which those courses could be made more relevant to the needs of their students and that changes be made accordingly. There seems to be a basic difference between the needs of an individual taking a correspondence course and the needs of a group of students in a school taking the same course. A degree of flexibility in the latter example would seem advantageous in order to match more closely the course with the school. Whether this is feasible, practical, and desirable should be investigated.

A common cause of criticisms of correspondence courses has been their heavy reliance upon print material. One of the recommendations in the case study was that representation should be made to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority and to the Correspondence Education Branch in order to determine whether the two agencies could cooperate in producing self-study materials that would have both audio-visual and print components. We repeat that recommendation here, except that we further recommend that the initiative for such representation come from the Ministry itself. Also, we note in passing that at least two other provincial ministries of education are pursuing the same endeavour.

We observe that the Ontario Educational Communications Authority (OECA) has produced a great deal of audio-visual material to support various course offerings, including some appropriate to students working at the basic and modified levels. However, there is a dearth of material designed for students working below the general level, and material designed by OECA and Correspondence Education with the special learning needs of those students in mind would surely be useful in many schools, not only as direct instructional material for students but also as guidelines for teachers who, because of new Special Education legislation, may find themselves required to teach at a lower level than that at which they have previously taught.

The Ontario Educational Communications Authority is also presently experimenting with Telidon, a type of two-way television. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, under contract with the Ministry of Education, is pioneering work in computer-assisted instruction. Both these devices, by providing immediate feedback to the student, should be a useful adjunct in schools where additional program is needed but where standard types of correspondence courses have not proved successful.

A further alternative for providing program flexibility, that of instruction by satellite, would be possible only through the Ministry of Education, probably through OECA. Experiments have already taken place in British Columbia (Martin, 1980), using the Anik B, a Canadian Federal Government Satellite. These suggest that instruction by satellite is feasible, although the necessary adaptations for its use in secondary schools may be one or two decades into the future.

An initiative by the Ministry of Education (rather than a school board) to establish regional summer schools would seem to be worthy of serious consideration. This initiative might take the form of encouraging boards to establish such schools, or might involve direct Ministry administration. The purpose of the schools would be to offer courses which local schools for a variety of reasons are unable to offer. The program for such schools could be made up of two components. The first of these could be correspondence courses similar to those offered throughout the school year but made available for a six-week period during July and August. The big advantage in taking such courses at a summer school is that there would be constant teacher supervision of the work. The second component would be those courses not readily available in small schools, such as technical, commercial courses and a program in art, music, drama, etc. We would envision students who attend the summer schools receiving various subsidies. One of these would be a course registration fee from their home boards if they came from another system. The Ministry could provide boarding allowances for non-resident students. Experience elsewhere tends to show that the number of non-resident students at such summer schools is minimal. However, in remote areas, the Ontario picture may be substantially different since it is in those areas that program options are reduced.

A further course of action suggested for the Ministry is that of coordinating production of packaged hands-on types of courses, based on Ministry guidelines and designed to fill gaps in school programs caused by the shortage of qualified staff. Similar courses have been mentioned in various contexts in previous sections of this report. At this point, we mention that the need for them is not confined to any one region of the province. Consequently, a coordinating role on the part of the Ministry seems called for. The aspect of Ministry coordination rather than actual construction of the course is emphasized. Other jurisdictions using these packaged courses strongly recommend that they be created by teachers familiar with the settings in which they will be used.

Experimental Courses. In our examination of implications and alternatives at the school and system level, we discussed the place of experimental courses in the school program. We suggested that such courses might originate at the school or system level, as outlined in H.S.1, 1979-81. We now further suggest that the Ministry, under sub-section 13.2, Experimental Courses, make provision for courses initiated for, or by, individual students. The usual conditions attendant upon such courses would remain, but for those students who take the initiative it would present a rather unique experience in relevance.

Climate. The gulf between school systems and the Ministry of Education is a mixture of the real and the artificial: real because of the difficulty faced by any supra-system in communicating with its sub-systems; artificial in that it is occasionally convenient to have a scapegoat to blame for the vicissitudes of professional life. Problems in communication between the Ministry, school systems, and schools seem to vary from region to region and even from school to school within the same region. The process of transferring a vast quantity of Ministry information on paper creates its own set of problems. Our research suggests that many schools have exploited the provisions of H.S.1 for the fullest benefits of their students. Other schools have seen the same provisions as a stumbling block. Still others try to ignore directions which do not match their particular situations.

In times of economic stringency and their attendant concerns with evaluation and accountability, in times of public reaction against the perceived excesses of the early 1970's; and given the political aspect of education which ensures a certain amount of government responsiveness to public opinion, it is difficult for the Ministry to maintain a popular image in educators' eyes. Yet, it must balance its responsiveness to both the educational and public sectors. This often means that it must be prepared to pay for new programs, while at the same time trying to hold the line on expenses.

The Ministry of Education, then, operates in a climate that is not altogether of its own making. One aspect of that climate results from the Ministry's communication procedures and, [illegible] course, the regulations and legislation which are disseminated by those procedures. We strongly recommend that, insofar as it is consistent with its financial and human resources, the Ministry should attempt to individualize its relationships with Ontario school boards and schools in order to communicate more effectively with them. Communication at a very personal level might help obviate some of the misunderstanding that presently characterizes some school board-Ministry relationships.

Discussion

In our discussion of implications and alternatives, we have argued for responsive, responsible and creative thinking on the part of schools, systems, and the Ministry. Most school boards possess characteristics that make them unique in one way or another. Yet, at the same time, they face common problems such as the necessity of providing a wide range of programs at various levels of difficulty in schools of different sizes. Most schools and boards try to do this on their own. We have recommended an approach that may call for cooperation among schools and among boards, and between those institutions and branches or divisions of the Ministry of Education. The purpose of this cooperation is not to lessen local autonomy but rather to increase the program options available to students.

Having now recommended cooperation among jurisdictions, we hasten to recognize that because this is not the usual pattern of operation, it will be a slow process. Most school boards, we believe, would prefer to be self-sufficient: in cooperative ventures there are usually losses as well as gains incurred. Nevertheless, we feel that there is more to be gained than lost. This applies to relatively small isolated schools as well as to schools in more built-up areas. In schools soon to become small, cooperation seems almost essential in order that students may continue to have a variety of options from which to choose. As well, some of the alternatives presented earlier in this chapter may help serve the same purpose.

Two watchwords of educationists as they face the 1980's may well be "creativity" and "cooperation."

Appendix A: Questionnaires for Secondary School Principals

SECONDARY SCHOOL ORGANIZATION STUDY

School ____________________ Board ____________________ Principal ____________________

Please check ☑ all applicable categories in the questions below.

1. School Characteristics

		Levels of instruction offered (Gr. 9 to 13)			
		Modified	Basic	General	Advanced
Junior High School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Secondary School Gr.9-12	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Secondary School Gr.9-13	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Secondary School Gr.10-13	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Secondary School Gr.13	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Alternate School. Please describe. This space may also be used for comments related to school characteristics.

____

____

____

____

2. Language of Instruction

English ☐ French ☐ English and French ☐

Other ☐ Please describe. ____________________

SECONDARY SCHOOL ORGANIZATION STUDY (Cont.)

1. Enrolment
Sept.1979 ______ 1978 ______ 1977 ______ 1976 ______ 1975 ______

2. Please list any subjects and courses in which there seems to be a pronounced trend toward declining enrolment. Then for each entry, code any apparent reason for this trend, using the code letters explained below.

	Reason	Use Code Letter
(a)	changes caused by Ministry policy (e.g. new core subjects)	P
(b)	societal trends towards vocational subjects related to post-secondary employment	S
(c)	declines caused by student choices of less demanding subjects	C
(d)	other reasons. Any explanation you can give would be appreciated.	O

Subject/Course	Code	Subject/Course	Code	Subject/Course	Code

Comments:

3. Over the past few years, how has your school program been affected/changed by Ministry of Education legislation and regulations? (For example, introduction of core programs, changes in levels of difficulty, etc.)

4. Give details of any organization/program changes in your school which have occurred over the past five years. (For example: (1) changes from or towards semestering or traditional forms of organization (2) timetabling of subjects (3) stacking of classes (4) offering subjects every second year etc.)

5. If there have been organization/program changes, please comment upon the reasons for them (e.g., declining enrolments, new Ministry regulations regarding compulsory credits, etc.).

6. Please list and comment upon any cooperation that exists between your school and any other school, or organization such as a church, library, business, industry, etc. (e.g. subjects offered in only one school, shared staff, facilities, twinning, cooperative education, work experience).

7. In what ways, if any, has the size of your school and/or declining enrolment restricted the range of program which might be offered.

8. During the past few years, what effect have collective agreements between your board and teachers' federations had upon school programs? (Include supervisory duties, timetabling, etc.)

We would like to follow up this survey by documenting some case studies of selected schools which are going through the throes of declining enrolment or which face program restraint because of their size. If you would be agreeable to participating in this follow-up, please check here.

Thank you! [ ] Willing to participate

Appendix B: Collective Agreements Containing Pupil-Teacher Ratio, Instructional Load, Class Size, and Surplus/Redundancy Provisions Related to School Program

1. Carleton

*2. Central Algoma

3. Durham

*4. Espanola

5. Essex County

6. Frontenac County

7. Grey County

8. Halton

9. Hamilton

10. Huron County

11. Lanark County

12. Leeds and Grenville

13. Lennox and Addington

14. Lincoln County

15. London

16. Metro Toronto

*17. Michipicoten

18. Muskoka

19. Niagara South

20. Nipissing

21. North Shore

22. Northumberland and Newcastle

**23. Ottawa

24. Peel

**25. Peterborough County

26. Prescott and Russell

27. Renfrew County

28. Simcoe County

29. Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry

**30. Sudbury

31 Victoria County

32. Wellington County

33. Wentworth County

34. Windsor

35. York County

* Boards with only one school

** Boards using formulas to determine PTF for individual schools

Collective Agreements Containing Instructional Load Provisions

(as of Winter, 1980)

1. Carleton
2. Espanola
3. Essex
4. Geraldton
5. Haldimand
6. Haliburton
7. Hamilton
8. Huron County
9. Kent County
10. Lambton County
11. Lakehead
12. Lanark County
13. Leeds and Grenville
14. Lennox and Addington County
15. Lincoln County
16. London
17. Metropolitan Toronto
18. Michipicoten
19. Niagara South
20. Nipigon-Red Rock
21. Nipissing
22. Norfolk
23. North Shore
24. Ottawa
25. Peel
26. Prescott and Russell County
27. Red Lake
28. Renfrew County
29. Sault Ste. Marie
30. Simcoe County
31. Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry
32. Wentworth County
33. West Parry Sound
34. Windsor

Collective Agreements Containing
Class Size Provisions
(as of Winter, 1980)

1. Central Algoma
2. Frontenac County
3. Hamilton
4. Huron County
5. Kent County
6. Lakehead
7. Lake Superior
8. Lambton County
9. Leeds and Grenville County
10. Lincoln County
11. Metropolitan Toronto
12. Michipicoten
13. Niagara South
14. Nipigon-Red Rock
15. Nipissing
16. Norfolk
17. North Shore
18. Northumberland and Newcastle
19. Ottawa
20. Sault Ste. Marie
21. Simcoe County
22. Temiskaming
23. Windsor

Collective Agreements Containing Surplus/Redundancy Provisions Related to School Program (as of Winter, 1980)

1. Central Algoma
2. Dryden
3. Elgin County
4. Lambton County
5. Lennox and Addington County
6. Lincoln County
7. Peel
8. Simcoe County
9. Sudbury
10. Timmins
11. Wentworth County